

VOLUME XVIII

NUMBER 1

January 1923

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

*A Quarterly Journal devoted to research
in the Languages, Literatures, History,
and Life of Classical Antiquity* ♡ ♡

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

The Cambridge University Press, *London*; The Maruzen-Kabushiki-Kaisha, *Tokyo, Osaka,
Kyoto, Fukuoka, Sendai*; The Mission Book Company, *Shanghai*

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

CHARLES HENRY BEESON
ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER

PAUL SHOREY, *Managing Editor*
CARL DARLING BUCK
ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER
HENRY W. PRESCOTT

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANK FROST ABBOTT, *Princeton University*
WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Wesleyan University*
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*
FRANCIS W. KELSEY, *University of Michigan*
WALLACE M. LINDSAY, *University of St. Andrews*

GORDON JENNINGS LAING, *McGill University*
JOHN C. ROLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*
CHARLES FORSTER SMITH, *University of Wisconsin*
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*
BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, *University of California*

VOL. XVIII

CONTENTS FOR JANUARY 1923

No. 1

Loxus, Physician and Physiognomist	By Geneva Misener	1
The Doubling of Roles in Roman Comedy	By Henry W. Prescott	23
The Poet Kar' Ἐφοῦν	By A. M. Harmon	35
Notes on the Multiplication of Cities in Ancient Geography	By Allen B. West	48
Notes and Discussions		68
ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL: Two Impressions of an Aldine Play.—J. Révay: Petroniana.—JOHN C. ROLFE: On Cicero, <i>Ad Fam.</i> vii. 10. 2.—NICHOLAS E. CHORNY: <i>Odyssey</i> 2 536-37. <i>Iliad</i> v. 895-87. PAUL SHOREY: On <i>Iliad</i> XXIII. 70.— <i>The Journal of Philology</i> .		
Book Reviews		76

FRASER: *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion* (Bonner).—HEADLAM: *Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments* (Woodhead).—KER: *Martial. Epigrams* (Laing).—LINDERBAUER: *Regula Monachorum* (Rand).—FRANK: *The Economic History of Rome to the End of the Republic* (Milner).—FRASER, Apollodorus, *The Library*.—KUCH: *Quellenuntersuchungen zu Nemesios von Emesa* (Shorey).—EVANS: *Alliteratio Latina or Alliteration in Latin Verse Reduced to Rule with Special Reference to Catullus, Horace, Juvenal, Lucan, Lucretius, Martial, Ovid, Persius, Phaedrus, Propertius, Statius, Tibullus, and Virgil* (Fraser).—ROSTOVETZKY: *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C.: A Study in Economic History* (West).

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.00. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Uruguay, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Spain. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.04); for all other countries in the Postal Union 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.25), on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.06). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 12. 3s. 6d. each; single copies, including postage, 5s. 9d. each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUSEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori Sancho-me, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 8.95; single copies, including postage, Yen 2.25.

For China: THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, 13 North Szechuen Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$4.00; single copies, \$1.00, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, on yearly subscriptions 25 cents, on single copies 6 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Y

constin
ity
fornia

No. 1

1

23

35

48

68

76

y the
sub-
ers on
ama.
maia.
pain.
single
otions
yable

land.
h.
nomo-
stage.

scrip-
sub-
ation.
when

o the

ugust

1917.

Classical Philology

VOLUME XVIII

January 1923

NUMBER I

LOXUS, PHYSICIAN AND PHYSIOGNOMIST

BY GENEVA MISENER

As a science the beginning of the study of physiognomy¹ was not auspicious. Along with medicine it was a part of magic and seercraft. A Syrian magician, Zopyrus,² was, tradition says, the first to practice the art at Athens, where he read the character of Socrates and prophesied for him a violent death. Whatever its first associations were, when it appears finally in literature it has acquired a semblance of science by appropriating doctrines from the philosophical and medical schools. Hippocrates³ and Pythagoras⁴ are claimed as its discoverers, an indication of its early affiliation with scientific thought. Hippocrates' treatise "De aere, aquis, locis," on the influence of geographical and climatic conditions upon the physique and temperament of races may have given a scientific foundation to the earliest recorded branch of physiognomy, the ethnological. The corpus of works under his name and later medical literature contain many references

¹ Φυσιγνωμονία occurs first in Hipp. *ap.* Galen xix. 530 K; φυσιγνωμονικός, Hipp. *Epidem.* ii. 5.1; φυσιγνωμών, Arist. *G.A.* iv. 769. 20, Theocr. *Epigr.* ii. 1; the verb, Arist. *an. pr.* ii. 27, p. 70 b 7; Dem., p. 799, 21.

² Diog. Laert. ii. 5. 24. 45 (citing Arist.); Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* iv. 37. 80; *de fato* 5. 10. Cf. the references collected by Foster, *Script. Physiog.*, pp. vii f. Zeller, *Phil. d. Griech.*, ii. 1. 64, thinks the anecdote about Socrates unhistorical.

³ Galen iv. 797 K.

⁴ Hippol. *refut. haeres.* i. 2; Porphyrt. *vit. Pythag.* 13.

to its use in the prognosis of diseases.¹ The debt of the physiognomists to zoological science may be measured by the popularity of this method of interpreting character and their numerous borrowings from Aristotle's studies on animals.² Aristotle³ admits τὸ δὲ φυσιογνωμεῖν δυνατόν ἐστιν, εἴ τις δίδωσιν ἅμα μεταβάλλειν τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν, ὅσα φυσικὰ ἐστὶ παθήματα. The problem, for him, consists in the finding of an accurate system of isolating the psychic qualities and the corresponding physical signs of the several species of animals. The investigations of Aristotle and the Peripatetic school in ethics and psychology also found popular expression in a new method of physiognomy, the new pathognomic, and in the portraits of ethical types.

The earliest extant treatise on physiognomy bears the name of Aristotle. It is, however, an incomplete epitome of two independent handbooks of the Peripatetic school.⁴ The technique of the subject is already fully developed and stereotyped at the time of the writing of these books. Later physiognomists refine it in detail but add little that is new in method. The first ps. Aristotle⁵ speaks of three earlier schools, the ethnologists, the pathognomists, and the zoölogists. The author himself follows the eclectic and other more modern methods. The remaining technical works are paraphrases or compilations of three major sources, ps. Aristotle, Polemo, a Greek rhetorician of the time of Trajan and Hadrian, and Loxus, a Greek physician. The original work of Polemo is not extant but can be reconstructed, in great part, from several later versions.⁶ The most faithful of these is an Arabic transcript contained in the codex Leidensis. Another is in the form of an abbreviated paraphrase by Adamantius, a Greek sophist of the third or fourth century. The

¹ Galen *de decubitu* xix. 530 K, quotes Hipp. ὅπόσοι τὴν ἰατρικὴν ἀσκέοντες φυσιογνωμονίης ἀμοιρεύουσι, τούτων ἡ γνώμη ἀνὰ σκότος κυλινδουμένη καθρὰ γηράσκει. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 581 K (Hipp.); Hipp. *Epidem.* ii. 5. 1; ii. 5. 16; ii. 5. 23; vi. 1. 2; vi. 8. 26; iii. 3. 14; i. 2. 9; Foster, II. pp. 283 f., excerpts from Galen; Diocles *ap. Gal.* xix. 530 K.

² Cf. *infra*, pp. 27 and 31.

³ *An pr.* 21. 27, p. 70 b 7; cf. *de an.* i. 407 b 13; *G.A.* 769 b 18, a criticism of the large claims of the zoological physiognomists, φυσιογνώμων δὲ τις ἀνῆγε πάσας εἰς δύο ζῶων ἢ τριῶν ὄψεις καὶ συνέπειθε πολλάκις λέγων. ps. Arist. (Foster, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 10-12), recognizes the same difficulties as inherent in the zoological method.

⁴ Cf. Foster, I, pp. xviii f.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 6, ll. 10 f.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I, pp. lxxvi f.

third is to be found in a collation by an unknown Latin writer of the works of Loxi medici, Aristotelis philosophi, Polemonis declamatoris. The Latin compiler Rose (*Anecdota Graeca*, pp. 70 f.) identifies as Apuleius, but Foster,¹ on the ground of Latinity, holds that he must belong to a much later age, possibly the end of the fourth century.

In the collation of his three sources the Latin writer has adopted this plan: "quae enim Polemo dixit et consentanea sunt reliquis auctoribus propemodum prosecuti sumus; quae proprie Loxus seu Aristoteles posuerint vel aliter interpretati sint"—he has added either *locis suis* or collected in two miscellaneous chapters. Two important deviations from his plan are acknowledged by the collator, the first in the types of characters, which are taken from Aristotle and Polemo, and the second in the zoölogy, where he prefers Loxus. The identity of two of the sources can be established beyond a doubt. The excerpts from Aristotle show that the writer had before him the ps. Aristotelian books but in a fuller text than that now extant. His version of Polemo though briefer agrees in the main with those of the Arabic translator and Adamantius. Loxus alone is a mere name which occurs only once elsewhere in Greek literature, in Origen (*con. Celsum* 1. 33): ἐὰν δέ καὶ τὰ τῶν φυσιογνωμονούντων κρατῇ εἴτε Ζωπύρον εἴτε Λόξον εἴτε Πολέμωνος. . . .

Rose² makes the order of mention of the three names in the Latin work and the greater simplicity of Loxus' zoölogy an argument for his priority to Aristotle. His theory that the soul has its seat in the blood recalls the αἷμα καὶ πνεῦμα of the Platonic school and the medical literature of the period of Plato and Aristotle. The evidence for the name he questions as too slight. It must be, he suggests, a corruption in the MSS of both Origen and the Latin writer of the name of the better known Eudoxus of Cnidus who is said to have placed a high value upon the blood. Foster³ points out the improbability of the double textual error. He would ascribe to Loxus other passages in the anonymous work where his name is not mentioned—the introduction, the chapters on hair and the skin, the description of the type *molles*, and the greater part of the epilogue. In the ps. Aristotelian treatise zoölogical physiognomy, Foster believes, is just

¹ *Ibid.*, I, pp. cxxx i f.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 81 f.

³ *Rhein. Mus. f. Phil.*, XLIII, pp. 505 f.

beginning but with Loxus it is a well-developed method. Where the latter deviates from ps. Aristotle he is fuller and subtler. Again in the ethnology of chapter ix he substitutes for the Scythians of ps. Aristotle the later known Celts. Two quotations from Loxus seem to have come originally from the Stoic Cleanthes who also practiced physiognomy. Loxus, Foster concludes, cannot have lived before the middle of the third century.

If we may believe our Latin authority, Loxus stands apart from the other physiognomists chiefly in his theory of the seat of the soul.¹ This question of the location of the soul is one of the most keenly debated in antiquity. It assumes different forms with the advance of thought. For the early thinkers it is the elementary physical problem, what is the vital substance, by means of what do we perceive and think. On the principle that like comprehends like they connect consciousness with a primary cosmic element,² or a suitable crasis³ of the elements such as the blood. Later as a result of the physiological inquiries of the medical schools the question commonly took this form, what is the chief organ of the body, the center of all the conscious and vital processes. The Sicilian school of medicine,⁴ the Cnidian, Aristotle,⁵ and the Stoics⁶ answer that the heart is the center alike of corporate and conscious life; Alcmaeon of Croton and the Pythagoreans, the Coan leader Hippocrates, Democritus and Plato make the brain the acropolis of the body, the seat of intelligence.⁷ The earlier question still recurs but is altered to, what is the medium by which the soul's activities are transmitted to and from the center. In the early fifth century it is the more primi-

¹ Foster, II, pp. 4 and 20 f.

² Cf. *Anaxim.* i. 3, 4; *Herakl. Diels fr.* 36. 118; *Plat. Phaed.* 96 B.

³ *Parmen. Theophr. de sensu* 1 f.; *Emped. Diels fr.* 105, 107, 109; *Zeno, Diog. Laert.* ix. 29; *Plat. Phaed.* 86 B; *Arist. de anima* 404 b 8; *Siebeck, Gesch. d. Psych.*, I, 1, 87 and 139 f.

⁴ *Theodoret. v.* 22. 6; 'Εμπεδοκλῆς δὲ καὶ 'Αριστοτέλης Διοκλῆς (emended by Wellmann from 'Αριστοκλῆς) καὶ τῶν Στωϊκῶν ἡ ἐνυμμία τὴν καρδίαν ἀπεκλήρωσαν τοῦτο (sc. τῷ ἡγεμονικῷ). Wellmann, *Die Frag. d. Siz. Ärzte*, pp. 14 f., 44 f., 103.

⁵ *P.A.* 665 b 12 f.; *de vita* 468 b 28 f., 469 b 4; *G.A.* 738 b 16, 740 a 21 f. Animals without blood have analogous central organ, *P.A.* 647 a 30, 648 a 1.

⁶ Stoics are divided; leaders of the school favor the heart, *Siebeck, op. cit.*, I, 2, 266; *Zeller*, 3, 1, 197 f.; *Plut. pl.* iv, 4, 2; *Sext. Math.* ix. 119; *Tert. de an.* c. 15.

⁷ Wellmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 16, 19 f.; *Aëtius. plac.* iv. 5. 391 D; *Fuchs, Anecd. Med.*, I, 540.

tive question which is debated although Alcmaeon's¹ famous guess is already stimulating thought in another direction. It is the problem that troubled the youthful Socrates: καὶ πολλάκις ἐμαντὸν ἄνω κάτω μετέβαλλον σκοπῶν πότερον τὸ αἷμά ἐστιν ᾧ φρονοῦμεν ἢ ὁ ἀήρ ἢ τὸ πῦρ· ἢ τούτων μὲν οὐδέν, ὃ δ' ἐγκέφαλός ἐστιν ὃ τὰς αἰσθήσεις παρέχων τοῦ ἀκούειν καὶ ὁρᾶν καὶ ὁσφραίνεισθαι, ἐκ τούτων δὲ γίγνεται μνήμη καὶ δόξα (Plat. *Phaed.* 96 B). The controversy centers around Empedocles' theory that the blood is the most sentient substance in the body, particularly the blood near the heart where the elements are most perfectly blended.² Thought and perception are most accurate, he believes, when the elements that compose the blood are equal and moderate in size and not separated by long intervals. Rarity and coarseness of texture produce sluggish, laborious natures. Blood composed of dense fine particles being swift in movement causes men to be rash, to attempt many things and to accomplish little.³ This theory is vigorously opposed by Hippo,⁴ a physician of Croton, who argues that soul cannot be blood because the seed⁵ which is rudimentary soul is not blood but moisture. Upon moisture depend alike health and keenness of thought. Critias⁶ of Athens upholds the opposite view, asserting that it is sentience which is most distinctive of soul and that sentience is due to the nature of the blood. Another monist of this period, Diogenes of Apollonia, reverts to air as the vital principle but concedes that it penetrates the body with the blood. Physical and psychic well-being are conditioned by the proper blending of air and blood.⁷

¹ Theophr. *de sensu* 25 f.; Plat. *Phaed.* 96 b; Arist. *de vita* 469 a 2.

² Diels, *Frag. d. Vorsokr.*, fr. 105, 107, 109, 110; Arist. *de an.* 404 b 8.

³ Theophr. *de sensu* 10 f., 23 f.; Tertull. *de an.* 5, 3, 20.

⁴ Arist. *de an.* 405 b 1; cf. Hick's note, p. 232; Anon. *Lond. Eclog.* ii. 12 οἰκέλας εἶναι ὑγρότητα καθ' ἣν ἀσθενόμεθα καὶ ἣ ζῶμεν. Schol. Arist. *Ven. ad Nub.* 94 f., Hippo satirized by Cratinus.

⁵ Wellmann, pp. 3, 51, a much discussed question among fifth and fourth century medical writers.

⁶ Arist. *de an.* p. 405 b 6.

⁷ Theophr. *de sensu* c. 43 f. Whenever much air mingles with the blood and making it lighter so permeates the body well-being results; when, contrary to nature, the air does not mingle, συνιζάνοντος τοῦ αἵματος καὶ ἀσθενεστέρου καὶ πυκνότερου γενομένου, pain follows. Courage, health, and opposites are dependent on like conditions. c. 44, φρονεῖν δὲ τῷ ἀέρι καθαρῷ καὶ ξηρῷ. Even Diogenes seems to have been influenced by the Empedoclean theory of the blood.

The Hippocratean writings are divided by the controversy. The author of *περί φυσῶν*, c. 14, while adhering to the Empedoclean theory accepts the compromise offered by Diogenes. He makes the blood the greatest contributor to intelligence but in the aetiology of mental diseases ascribes psychic disturbances to stoppages in the blood's course caused by an excessive quantity of *pneuma*.¹ The Sicilian dogma prevails in the Cnidian treatise *On Diseases*,² that of Diogenes in the work *On Flesh*.³ All monistic theories of the soul's substance are attacked by the writer of *On the Nature of Man*.⁴

Near the end of the fifth century another doctrine of the Sicilian school gained general acceptance, namely, that the heart is the source of the blood.⁵ In the ps. Hippocratean treatise *On the Heart*,⁶ the first complete study of this organ, it is described as the vital center, the source of the veins and ἡ μεγάλη ἀρτηρία which contain both blood and air. The left ventricle of the heart is the seat of the natural heat (c. 6. 12) and pure intelligence (c. 10); γνώμη γὰρ ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πέφυκεν ἐν τῇ λαίῃ κοιλίῃ καὶ ἄρχει τῆς ἄλλης ψυχῆς. It is nourished by καθαρή καὶ φωτεινὴ περιουσίη γεγωννίη ἐκ τῆς διακρίσιος τοῦ αἵματος. This view that the heart is the center of consciousness became the basic distinction between the Sicilian and Cnidian schools of medicine and the Coan which located the intelligence in the brain.⁷

¹ c. 14. The effect on the mind of changes in the blood is illustrated by sleep when the blood is cooled, and intoxication, πλεονος εξαίφνης γενομένου τοῦ αἵματος, and utter loss of intelligence due to a complete disturbance of the blood. Whenever much *pneuma* through all the body mingles with the blood, πολλά ἑμφράγματα γίνεται πολλαχῇ ἀνὰ τὰς φλέβας. It causes unevenness in the course of the blood and corresponding psychic disturbances.

² 1. 30, τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ πλεῖστον συμβάλλεται μέρος συνείσιος· ἐνιοὶ δὲ λέγουσι τὸ πᾶν. Phrenitis is caused by the overflow of bile in the blood which διεκίνησε καὶ διώρρωσε τὸ αἷμα ἐκ τῆς ἐσθυίης συστάσιος τε καὶ κινήσιος καὶ διεθέρμηνε· διαθερμανθὲν δὲ διαθερμαίνει καὶ τὸ ἄλλο σῶμα πᾶν καὶ παρανοεῖ τε ἄνθρωπος. Cf. Wellmann, p. 18.

³ c. 2.

⁴ 1. c. 2, c. 6.

⁵ Cf. Wellmann, p. 73, where he concludes that this theory had its origin with Emped.; cf. Diels, fr. 105; *Censor. de die nat.* vi. 1; Wellmann, p. 102, points out that it is recognized as correct by the author of *On the Sacred Disease*, c. 17, *On Diseases* iv. 33; *Nature of Bones*; *περί τρώφης* c. 31; *Plat. Tim.* 70 B, 81 A f.

⁶ C. 6 f. cf. Wellmann, pp. 94 f. The date of this treatise is uncertain. It is the earliest anatomical work we possess (Wellmann, p. 98) and is without doubt under the influence of the Sicilian school and particularly of Diocles who, Wellmann thinks, may have located the ψυχικὸν πνεῦμα in the left side of the heart. Stoic psychology is similar (p. 105).

⁷ Wellmann, pp. 14, 77, 103; Hipp., *περί ιερ. νόσ.*, c. 16; Theodoret, v. 22. 6.

An early exponent of it is Diocles of Carystus, a distinguished physician of the first half of the fourth century.¹ He diverges from the Empedoclean teaching not only in centralizing the psychic functions in the heart but in substituting for the blood the *ψυχικὸν πνεῦμα* as the conveyor of intelligence from the heart to the brain and the rest of the body.² The polemic of the Coan treatise *On the Sacred Disease*³ against this view proves, Wellmann thinks, that it did not originate with Diocles. The pneumatic theory of the soul was, he believes, a leading dogma of medical circles two generations before Aristotle.⁴

The physiological psychology of Aristotle shows the influence of the Sicilian school. The blood is no longer believed to be sentient.⁵ The *συμφυτὸν πνεῦμα*, an exhalation in the body due to the action of the organic heat, passing through the veins with the blood conveys sensations from the central seat, the heart.⁶ The activities of the soul, however, have their physical bases in the blood. Thick and warm blood is more productive of physical strength but the thinner and colder of perception. The solid earth-like fibers in the thick blood when heated by the *θυμός* give off more heat than the moist element and tend to cause a *ζέσιν ἐν τοῖς θυμοῖς*. The lighter blood having more moisture is more subject to the cooling action of fear but being purer of fiber is more quickly moved in perception. The condition favorable to the nutritive functions of the soul is detrimental to the intellectual and sentient. Excess of fibrine and excess of moisture are conducive to the opposite defects of character, the choleric and the timid. The best condition of the blood for the ideal mean,

¹ Well., p. 66.

² Fuchs, *Anecd. Med.*, 5, 543; 2, 541; 1, 540; 20, 550. Wellmann, p. 15 and pp. 77, 79, 103, 107. Diocles appears to have effected a compromise between the Sicilian theory and the Coan.

³ C. 16; Wellmann, pp. 77, 105. The Coan school taught that the pneuma passed first to the brain and thence to the other parts of the body.

⁴ Wellmann, pp. 76 f. Probably Philistion, a contemporary of Plato, first developed the theory. It was accepted by the later schools of Praxagoras, Herophilos, and Erasistratus, and by the Stoics. Cf. Zeller, *op. cit.*, 3, 1, p. 195, n. 2; Siebeck, *op. cit.*, 1, 2, 134 f.

⁵ Arist. *P.A.* 650 b 3 f.

⁶ Arist. *de vit.* 469 b 6 f.; *G.A.* 736 a 33 f.; 736 b 29, 737 a 5 f., 744 a 3, 762 a 20, 781 a 23; *P.A.* 665 b 9 f–667 b 12, 667 b 18 f.; Zeller, *Phil. Griech.*, 11, 2, 483 f., *ibid.*, 517, n. 6; Siebeck, *op. cit.*, 1, 2, 134 f., 140 f.

courage, and for intelligence is a combination of the qualities warm and thin and pure.¹

The physiology of the soul was a fundamental problem for the students of physiognomy. It is impossible, however, from the late paraphrases and epitomes to trace the development of their thought and its relation to the contemporary medical and philosophical schools. The compiler of the first Peripatetic handbook reduces the philosophical discussion to that necessary for the validation of his teaching, the sympathy of body and soul,² and the continuity of the same physical and psychic qualities in each species.³ The second treatise is more imbued with learning. The doctrine of sympathy is supported by an illustration drawn, evidently, from medical literature.⁴ In explanation of the signs of movement the author applies a complicated theory of the influence of the size and temperament of the body upon the mind. Alertness and slowness depend upon the size of the body. The length of the blood's course determines how swiftly sensations arrive in the mind. Small persons with dry flesh and warm coloring are inefficient; for the course of the blood being confined to a small space and accelerated by the heat causes their minds to be unstable, to be ever passing from one thing to another before accomplishing the first. The opposite extreme with large, moist, and cold bodies are inefficient in a different way. Where the blood is retarded by the cold and the space to be covered large the sensation does not complete its course *πρὸς τὸ νόουν*.⁵ Two

¹ Arist. *P.A.* 648 a 2 f., 650 b 14 f., 651 a 12, *de somno* 456 a 34, *P.A.* 650 a 34, *G.A.* 740 a 21, cf. *P.A.* 667 a 9, the activity of intellect depends also on the character of the heart; so, too, courage and cowardice.

² Foster, *ibid.*, I, pp. 4 f.; cf. Arist. *an. pr.* ii. 27, p. 70 b 7, *de an.* 403 a 15, the doctrine of sympathy of soul and body; *ibid.*, 407 b 15, 414 a 17, body must be suited to soul. The illustrations used by the first ps. Aristotle also are similar to those of the medical writers; *δηλον πάνυ γίνεσθαι ἐν τε ταῖς μέθαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀρρωστίαις· πολὺ γὰρ ἐξαλλάττονται φαίνονται αἱ διάνοιαι ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦ σώματος παθημάτων*. Cf. Diog. of Apoll. ap. Theophr. *de sensu* c. 41 (intoxication); ps. Hipp. c. 14 (intoxication and madness). On Stoic doctrine of sympathy cf. Zeller, *op. cit.*, 3, 1, 170.

³ Foster, *ibid.*, I, p. 6; Arist., *op. cit.*, *supra*.

⁴ Foster, *ibid.*, I, p. 40; *καὶ οἱ ἰατροὶ φαρμάκοις καθαίροντες τὸ σῶμα καὶ διαίταις τισὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς χρησάμενοι ἀπαλλάττονται τὴν ψυχὴν τῆς μανίας*. Cf. Wellmann, *op. cit.*, p. 29 and n. 1, on therapy of mental diseases.

⁵ Cf. Peripatetic Strato, ap. Plut. *Solert. an.* 3. 6, p. 961, for dependence of sensation upon thought.

properly balanced conditions are possible, one from the combination of a small frame with moist and cold physical qualities, the other of a large body with dry and warm. The latter are not only efficient but keen of perception. A body of moderate size is most favorable to perception and efficiency.¹

The theory recalls Empedocles in the description of the two types of inefficiency and in the connection of perception with the activity of the blood. But it presupposes a center of consciousness τὸ νόον to which the sensations must pass by way of the blood. The writer, it appears from another passage² in the treatise, agrees with the Sicilian school and Aristotle in locating the center of sentience in the heart. To the crisis of the four physical qualities³ and the symmetrical balance of these with the size of the body the nearest parallels are found in the later elaboration of the doctrine of the temperaments by the Stoic school and Galen.⁴

With Loxus⁵ we return to the primitive conception of Empedocles. The blood is the seat of the soul. The signs given by the whole body and its parts vary with the swiftness or inertia of the blood, its fineness or coarseness, or as the blood's course is free and direct

¹ Foster, I, p. 86, ll. 4 f.; cf. *ibid.*, I, p. 20, l. 11, similar connection of intelligence with movement.

² Foster, I, 58, 15, those who are smaller from the breast to the neck than from the navel to the breast are slow in perception because the sensations are crowded into a narrower space; cf. Arist. *P.A.* 672 b 8-24; Zeller, I, 2, pp. 802 f.

³ Cf. Aristotle's theory outlined above where only two qualities are mentioned and these are ascribed directly to the fibrine in the blood and not to the temperament of the body. Cf. Diocles, Fuchs *Anecd.* 17, 548: 'Ὁ δὲ Διοκλῆς ζῆσιν τοῦ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αἵματος φησὶν εἶναι (sc. τὴν μανίαν) . . . ὅτι δὲ ἐπὶ ζῆσει γίνεσθαι τοῦ αἵματος δηλοῖ ἡ συνήθεια.' τοὺς γὰρ μανιώδεις τεθερμάνεσθαι φασί. So too Arist. cf. *Cael. Aur. m. chr.* i. 5. 173; cf. ps. Hipp. *περὶ φύσων*, c 14, in explanation of sleep.

⁴ Cf. Galen i. 332 f., where he explains how the several combinations of the four physical qualities in relation to the size of the thorax affect the θυμός which is located in the heart. A warm and dry heart combined with a small thorax causes the character to be passionate, quick, savage, headlong, choleric, and uncontrollable; the cold and moist, if the thorax is small, produces symmetry, if the thorax is larger a character incapable of anger. As in the ps. Aristotelian treatise, two unbalanced conditions are defined, one resulting from a combination of a warm and dry heart with a small thorax, the other of a cold and moist with a large. Similarly, mental qualities depend on the temperament of the brain; cf. i. 329. In i. 624 Galen criticizes the physiognomists for their unscientific generalizations about the temperament of the whole body from the signs of a part. Cf. Siebeck, I, 2, pp. 279 f., for a history of the development of the theory of temperaments.

⁵ Foster, 11, 4, ll. 1 f.; 20, ll. 10 f.

or perverse and narrow. When the blood is copious it causes the body to be large and ruddy, the hair solid and dense, but it constricts, dulls, and intercepts the keenness of the intellect and the senses. If the blood is fine and small in quantity it produces a weaker body, impairs the color, and diminishes all the parts but gives activity to the sense-organs of the head such as eyes, ears, tongue, and nose, and the veins of blood. It nourishes the intelligence and stimulates its keenness. Hence the middle temperament of the blood denotes an ideally blended soul of equal courage and wisdom. For Loxus and Aristotle alike the constitution of the soul in regard to intelligence and courage is interrelated with the constitution of the body. They are the antipodal results of the same physical causes. The condition of the blood favorable to bodily vigor is antagonistic to the intellectual, and that which quickens the senses lessens the physical powers. How courage is assured by the mean condition of the blood is not explained but it seems to be a concomitant of physical strength. Loxus stands midway between Empedocles and Aristotle. Like Empedocles he does not recognize any psychic center and defines the condition of the blood simply by its texture and movement. But where the former considers only the psychical effects of the blood's state Loxus contrasts the psychic and physical.¹ In this and the ideal blending of courage and wisdom he approaches Aristotle. No reference is made, however, to the Aristotelian excess and defect of courage, nor to the four qualities. Disturbances in the blood's course, it would seem, are ascribed to its thickness or to obstructions in the blood vessels,² not to the action of heat or cold.³ If Loxus is a physician of the late third century, as Foster holds,⁴ he must be entirely removed from the current of contemporary thought. He is unaffected by the well-known teaching of the Sicilian school that the

¹ Similarly Diog. of Apoll. Theophr. *de sensu* c. 43 makes pleasure and pain, and courage and health depend upon the thickness and sluggishness or opposite of the blood, these states being determined by the quantity of pneuma.

² Cf. ps. Hipp. *περί φνσών* c. 14: mental disturbances are caused by the *ἐμφράγματα* in the veins due to the excessive amount of pneuma.

³ Cf. ps. Hipp. *On Diseases* c. 30 and Diocles who ascribe these to heat of blood, *χωρίς ἐμφράξεως* (Fuchs *Anecd.*, 17, 548). Loxus applies hot and cold in the common literary sense to mental temperament but never to physical qualities.

⁴ Cf. *Phys. Graec.*, I, p. lxxi; *de Lozi Phys. Rhein. Mus. f. Phil.*, XLIII, 505 f.

heart is the source of the blood supply, by the long accepted pneumatic theory, the doctrine of the temperaments and by the discoveries of Herophilos and Erasistratus. In the main tenet of his theory he has not advanced beyond the early period of the fifth-century controversy when consciousness was not regarded as centralized in one organ but as diffused through the body in a circulating substance.

The anonymous compiler with his eye ever on his three sources wrote two chapters on hair, the last similar to the Arabic and Adamantian versions of Polemo,¹ the first connected almost as certainly with the name of Loxus by the reference to his theory of the blood.² The latter's more detailed treatment of this subject made it impossible to combine the two traditions—the constant aim of the collator. Much blood, Loxus thought, caused *soliditatem et densitatem* of the hair. A knowledge, therefore, of the hair *qui cum homine nascuntur*,³ such as that on the head, eyebrows, and eyes, is necessary to the physiognomist. Although Loxus' careful study of the hair must have made him an authority among the readers of character, his treatment was too complex for the practical uses of their handbooks. Both the ps. Aristotelian compilers and Polemo adopt a simpler form, interpreting each characteristic of the hair separately. The divergence in method may account for many of the variations in the later tradition. There are, in despite of this, not a few points of correspondence. Loxus' interpretation of a thick growth of hair around the temples as a sign of dissoluteness is found in the first ps. Aristotle's description of that type from which it was copied by Polemo.⁴ Again Loxus writes: "Capilli stabiles idemque nigri vel sordidi et aquati ruboris violentem hominem indicant; capilli molles et ultra modum tenues et rari penuriam sanguinis, enervem sine virtute et femininum animum indicant et quanto rariores fuerint tanto magis subdolum." In the simplified form of Polemo⁵

¹ Cf. Anon. 92, ll. 4 f.; Adam. 392, ll. 1 f.; Arab. 250, ll. 6 f.

² Cf. Anon. 22, ll. 7 f.

³ Cf. Arist. *H.A.* 518 a 18; the same distinction is made between αἱ ἀργυρεῖς which tend to fall out more quickly in the lustful while the δασεργεῖς grow more rapidly. Cf. Anon. 134. 2 (ps. Arist.), "Capillos in palpebris raros et defluentes."

⁴ Cf. Anon. 22 (Loxus), ps. Arist. 38, Arab. 278, Adam. 419, Anon. 126 and 133; Arist. *Probl.* iv. 880 a 34.

⁵ Arab. 248. 20 f., Adam. 392. 4 f., Anon. 92. 6.

the following signs correspond. Great thickness of hair betrays a nature like that of a wild beast; thinness and separation, on the contrary, guile and wickedness; soft hair is a feminine sign, hard hair a sign of savageness. Very light, almost white hair is associated by Polemo¹ with the savage northern races, uncouth and slow to learn. The last two signs of the hair are combined by Loxus in: "capilli flavi et crassi et albidiores indociles et indomitos mores; referuntur autem ad gentem Germanorum."² The first ps. Aristotle,³ likewise, refers hardness and softness of the hair as signs of courage and cowardice to the northern and southern races. This common tradition may have been inherited from the early ethnologists. Curly hair is made by the second ps. Aristotle⁴ a racial sign of timidity by reference to the Ethiopians. For Loxus it is a sign of both timidity and avarice, the first shown by the Egyptians, and the last by the Syrians. Polemo⁵ preserves the same two characteristics and illustrates the sign by the southern races. The popular belief that hair standing up straight denotes fear is accepted by all the physiognomists.⁶ Another type of straight hair is indicated by the Latin translator's *imminentes fronti*, a sign of ferocity. Polemo followed two traditions⁷ in the interpretation of ἰσθθηξ, one that of Loxus, the other of the first ps. Aristotle who associates it with the dissolute type.

Four distinctions were noted by Loxus in the outline of the hair as it recedes or encroaches upon the forehead or neck. Two of the forms with the same interpretations are used by the first ps. Aristotle in the descriptions of types and are copied from him by Polemo.⁸ Loxus, it would seem, confined his study of the hair to the parts of

¹ Adam. 392. 5 selects as examples of northern type the Scythians and Celts; Arab. 250. 11, those better known to himself and readers Selabi et Turci.

² Anon. 23. Cf., Anon. 14, in describing the earlier ethnological method, "hic Celto, i.e., Germanis est similis. Celti autem indociles, fortes feri." The identification of Celts and Germans may have been added by the Latin writer.

³ P. 20, 1 f. ⁴ P. 80. 7. ⁵ Arab. 248, Adam. 392. 383, Anon. 92.

⁶ Ps. Arist., p. 80, Adam. 396, Arab. 259, Anon. 129.

⁷ Anon. 97, Adam. 392, Arab. 248, ps. Arist. 38 (types), Adam. 319, Anon. (*prominens rectus*) i. 26. 133, Arab. 278.

⁸ Hair descending on the forehead indicates the spirited type, Anon. 24. 8 (Loxus), ps. Arist. 34. 15, Anon. 132. 3; hair receding, the mild type, ps. Arist. 36. 2, Adam. 418. 2, Anon. 125. 1, 132. 1; Loxus Anon. 24. 10 *minus calidum*.

the head. The Peripatetic physiognomists and Polemo describe the hair in detail on all parts of the body. The new importance of the hairiness of the body as a sign is undoubtedly due to the later scientific belief that it is a direct indication of the bodily temperament.¹ All excepting Loxus omit the treatment of the hair in the nose and ears, influenced, it may be, in the latter instance by the opinion of Aristotle. In *H.A.* 492 a 32, after distinguishing ears as hairy, bare, and medium, he adds that the medium is the best *πρὸς ἀκοήν· ἥθος δ' οὐδὲν σημαίνει*, a criticism aimed, evidently, at the current teaching of the physiognomists.

Cutis capitis is included among the significant parts of the body by the Latin writer alone. References to it, however, occur in the description of the spirited type by ps. Polemo (p. 427) and the shameless by the anonymous author (p. 131), both from the same source, the first ps. Aristotle. The dissimilarity of the interpretation of the latter points to a different tradition. It is possible that the Latin version was contributed by Loxus.

The Latin writer's method of collation is unfortunate for our knowledge of Loxus. We have only the negative record of his divergences from Polemo, and that incomplete, as nothing is said of the points omitted. Much confusion must have arisen from the diversity of methods in his sources, such as we see in the chapters on hair and eyes. Correspondences between different sections of their books would be likely to escape the collator. A few instances of unnoted similarities between Loxus and the descriptions of types in the other sources are to be found in the chapter of variants. The close relation of Loxus to Aristotle is also confirmed by this chapter.

Loxus selects three colors of the eyes as best in the following order of excellence: *χαρποί*, *αἰγωποί*, and *subnigri*. Aristotle (*H.A.* 491 b 34) gives the preference to *αἰγωποί* as a character sign and for keenness of sight. The physiognomists agree with Loxus in regard to the superiority of *χαρποί* eyes.² The *αἰγωποί* seem to have acquired

¹ Galen censures the physiognomists for drawing inferences about the temperament of the whole body from the hairiness of a part, and for not inquiring into causes. He confines his inferences to the part (i. 624 and 639 f.).

² Anon. 108 and 8.3 (male); ps. Arist. 26. 15; 30.2; 48. 20; 76. 15; Adam. 386. 5; 350. 3; Anon. 52. 3; Arab. 148. 6 (Hadrian); Adam. 317 f.

an unfavorable significance μάργοι in the post-Aristotelian¹ writers, owing, it may be, to the verbal association with αἷγες. Pingues eyes, the Latin equivalent of λιπαροί, are for Loxus a sign of the *mansueti verum ad libidinem et ad lacrimas faciles*. The epithet is used by the other physiognomists to describe similar types, the ἐλεήμονες and ever-weeping and the dissolute.² From the collator's long quotation about the eyelids it may be inferred that Loxus had made a more detailed study of this part. The eyelids are mentioned only twice by ps. Aristotle,³ both as features of typical characters. Polemo does not give them separate treatment, but includes them among the signs of types⁴ and subordinate signs of the eyes.⁵ The closest parallel to Loxus is supplied by Aristotle *H.A.* 491 a 22 where long ἀκανθοί at the juncture of the upper and lower eyelids denote κακοήθεια. Loxus (Anon. 110) is not unlike, "longa incisio et angusta et anguli oculorum in acutam incisio signify non integrum vel fidelem animum."

In zoological physiognomy the collator follows the brief and clear treatment of Loxus in preference to the obscure of ps. Aristotle⁶ and the laborious of Polemo.⁷ The faithful Arabic transcript of the latter

¹ Ps. Arist. 76. 16; Anon. 112. 1 (ps. Arist.); Arab. 248. 1; Adam. 391. 3 paraphrased by μαρμαρύσσοντα. The reading of Foster ἀμάρυσσον, Adam. 420. 1, should be changed to μαρμαρύσσον which is read in *BA* and *Matr.* 419. 12, ps. Pol. 420. 15. It is the equivalent of μάργον, ps. Arist. 38. 10; ps. Pol. 427. 12; cf. also Anon. 126. 2; Arab. 280. 2.

² Ps. Arist. 36. 14; 38. 10; Adam. 420. 1; Anon. 126. 2; ps. Pol. 420. 15 (ps. Arist.); 427. 12 (*ibid.*); 428. 2 (*ibid.*).

³ Ps. Arist. 30. 14; 84. 2. 4. 5; Anon. 130; 131. 8 (not found in present text of ps. Arist.); 135. 4 (Foster ascribes to Loxus. It is placed by the collator among the ps. Arist. types. A similar sign is interpreted by Loxus Anon. 109. 15 as *infirmus* and *imbecillus*).

⁴ Adam. 413. 7; 415. 2; Anon. 120. 9; 123. 1; 124. 7. Since Polemo follows ps. Arist. closely in his descriptions of types it is likely that many omissions in ps. Arist. are due to defects in text. Anon. 131. 8 points to a like lacuna in text.

⁵ Adam. 316. 2; 347. 2; Anon. 60, *et freq.*

⁶ In the extant text of ps. Arist. there are found only the criticism of the zoological method by the first author, p. 10, and the brief explanation of the method by the second, p. 42.

⁷ The Polemo MSS seem to have contained both a summarized treatment of zoology included in the general work and a longer special treatise based on a different tradition. The latter may have formed a separate book. Adam. 349 and Anon. 64 are still more abbreviated versions of the former. The Arabic copies the latter. Anon. evidently knew both.

contains a catalogue of the attributes of ninety-three species of animals! From Loxus only a few examples are chosen but sufficient to show his keenness of observation and his power of terse description. The two zoological traditions are too divergent to have emanated from the same source. Polemo gives only the psychic qualities of the animals, Loxus the physical as well and frequently an analysis of the characters of men resembling the animals. Only the lion and the leopard are fully described by the second ps. Aristotle.¹ These animals hold a unique place in physiognomy. They are believed to approach most nearly to the ideal male and female types. Polemo² selects representative male and female animals from the other classes also, from the birds the eagle and partridge, from the reptiles the dragon and viper. Descriptions of the lion and leopard alone are given for which he is indebted again to ps. Aristotle. The anonymous writer³ divides animals into four classes—*terrena*, *pennata*, *aquatilia*, and *serpentina*. From the first class the lion and boar are selected as typical males, the leopard, stag, and hare as females, in the second the eagle and hawk are male, the peacock, partridge, and magpie female. No descriptions are added. Ps. Aristotle and Polemo draw their pictures of the lion with a view to showing his resemblance to the ideal male type,⁴ for which he is substituted. The vocabulary of ps. Aristotle in particular is colored by this idealization.⁵ Loxus' physical description of the lion in his zoölogy is brief and uncolored though agreeing in some essential features with those of ps. Aristotle

¹ Cf. 48. 14 f.; 50. 19.

² Adam. 351. 4. (All descriptions are omitted.) Arab. 194. 7 (lacuna in MSS); 196. 7. The tradition is again defective; of the psychic characteristics of the lion only *cunctans* and *pudibundus* remain, which appear to have been taken from Polemo's zoölogy. The leopard's are entirely lacking.

³ 1, ll. 7 f.

⁴ Cf. the square face, *χαρσιν* eyes, moderately large features, shoulders large and free in movement, well-jointed frame, large above and narrow below, hard and solid flesh, which are ascribed elsewhere to the typical male. Both ps. Aristotle and the Arabic version describe the female type fully but give only psychic qualities of male. They refer briefly to the physical as opposite to the female's. Cf. ps. Arist. 48. 11; Arab. 196. 15 after the description of the lion adds "atque haec quidem maris descriptio." Many of the points ascribed above to the lion are found in the anonymous description of the male. The vocabulary shows the same coloring.

⁵ Note words such as *εὐμεγεθες*, *μετριός*, *εὐμηκες*, *εὐπλευρον*, *εὐνωτον*, *οὔτε λίαν* *οὔτε λίαν*.

and Polemo. In the analysis of the character of the lion as of all the other animals he is a naturalist, a close observer of the habits of animals. There is no trace of idealization. The lion is an animal "edendi avidum magis quam bibendi saevum cum irritatur, vehemens cum cibo indiget, tranquillum cum satiatum est, forte et invictum cum dimicat." Similar traits are noted by Aristotle *H.A.* 629 b 5 f.: The lion is cruel in feeding, when full fed gentle, not suspicious toward those whom he knows, but playful and affectionate. Pliny *N.H.* 8. 17. 19 cites Aristotle in refutation of the common report¹ of the lion's lust and cruelty and to a description derived in great part from him adds: "raros in potu, vesci alternis diebus."² Ps. Aristotle's³ analysis of the lion's character recalls this and other passages of Aristotle. The habits unsuited to his ideal picture are omitted. Polemo for his sketch of the character of the lion drew from his own zoölogy which though maintaining the nobility of the lion differs in several points from the Aristotelian tradition.⁴ The qualities which Loxus ascribes to persons of lion-like physique—*affectus nullus, nulla fides amicitiae, nulla religio*—are scarcely in accord with the peripatetic idealization of the lion. They resemble rather the common belief which Pliny claims is disproved by Aristotle's observations and his discovery of the two species. The authentic passages from Loxus show no trace of the identification of the lion with the male type. For the assigning of chapter viii, ll. 13 f. to him there is only the negative evidence of its variation from Polemo, unless with Foster⁵ we believe that the introduction as a whole is the work of Loxus. But the introduction is plainly no less eclectic than the remainder of the book. It appears to be a collection of excerpts from the prefaces of his three sources to which the collator has striven to give

¹ Cf. epithets of lion in Homer: *δοῦφρων* *Il.* xv. 630; *ὠμόφαγος* xv. 592; *σθένης μενεαίων* *Od.* 4. 335; *Il.* 21. 483 (Artemis a lion toward woman); savage, Aesch. *Cho.* 934, but brave, *Ag.* 1259, *et freq.*

² Cf. *Aelian de animal.* iv. 34, *πίνει δὲ ὀλίγου*, in a passage similar to the account of Aristotle and Pliny.

³ Cf. ps. Arist., p. 50, *δοτικόν, ἐλευθέριον, μεγαλόψυχον, φιλότιμον, πρᾶν, δίκαιον, φιλόστοργον* with Arist. *an. pr.* 11. 27, p. 70, *courageous, μεταδότικον; H.A.* 488 b 16, *ἐλευθέρια, ἀνδρεία, εὐγενή*, and *ibid.* 629 b 11 *φιλοπαίγμων, στερκτικός*.

⁴ Cf. *pudibundus*, Arab. 196, with Arab. 172, *leo, fortis, audax, iracundus, post gravitatem patiens, pudibundus, liberalis, magnanimus, insidiosus*.

⁵ *Rhein. Mus. f. Phil.*, XLIII, 511 f.

semblance of logical unity but not always with success. It begins with Loxus' theory of the soul's location and then passes to the Peripatetic and Stoic (*ceteri autem*) doctrine of the sympathy of body and soul. To the latter source belongs the comparison of the influence of the body on the spirit to that of a vessel on liquids or the several wind instruments on the breath. Foster's¹ argument for the late date of this passage is not relevant to Loxus. Chapters iii-vii inclusive on the sexes are of uncertain origin but may have come from Loxus. After a brief reference to the male and female types of animals the writer outlines the history of the study of physiognomy through its three phases in temporal sequence.² The first sentence of chapter x, "Haec praedicta sunt ad indicium . . . masculini et feminini generis," is clearly the conclusion to the earlier discussion of sex. An irrelevant sentence from Polemo³ on the mixture of signs is next inserted. It breaks the connection with a second statement about the sexes drawn from Loxus⁴ that a *bonum ingenium* consists in the combination of the *virtus* of the male with the *sapientia* of the female. Itaque in the next sentence introduces another disconnected topic, the method of choice from contradictory signs, a subject treated by Polemo.⁵ To the remainder of the chapter on the relative values of the parts as signs, with the exception of one sentence, close parallels occur in Polemo.⁶ This interpolated sentence (p. 16, l. 11) on the modification of the meaning of signs belongs to the next chapter where illustrations are given. The source is uncertain. Chapter xi closes with a series of excerpts from Polemo⁷ and possibly

¹ Foster, *ibid.*, p. 511, calls attention to the similarity of this passage to *Sen. Ep.* 18. 5. 10 where the comparison is ascribed to Cleanthes. The Stoic school adopted the doctrine of the sympathy of soul. Cf. Cleanthes *ap. Nemes. nat. hom.*, p. 33; Chrysipp. *ibid.*, p. 34.

² Cf. *ps. Arist.* 6. 10, similar, but chronological sequence and traits of races are not given.

³ Cf. *Adam.* 301. 5 f.

⁴ Cf. *Anon.* 21 and p. 33 of this article for discussion.

⁵ Cf. *Adam.* 301. 3 f.

⁶ For the preference for the signs of eyes and the eyes as *fores animae* cf. *Adam.* 305. 9, *Arab.* 168. 7; *Anon.* 31. 3; Foster, *Script. Phys.*, p. cv. For order of value of parts cf. *Arab.* 168. 3 f.; *Anon.* 62. 11 f.; *Adam.* 348. 10 f., of which *ps. Arist.* 90 f. is the original source.

⁷ Cf. *Adam.* 301. 8; 304. 9; 305. 11; cf. *parva* . . . habent, *Anon.* 18. 10 with *Adam.* 305. 14. cf. *Anon.* 19 on dissembling with *Adam.* 397, *Arab.* 256. 7 f., *Anon.* 94. 12 f., on artificial movements.

ps. Aristotle¹ on the skill required in detecting the natural character despite the artifices for concealment. The stories² told of the penetration of physiognomists are omitted by Adamantius as are also the many other anecdotes of Polemo preserved in the Arabic version. Polemo was rhetorician enough to relieve the dry matter of physiognomy with lively stories from his experience.

The perennial problem of the differences of the sexes tempted also the ancient students of physiology and psychology. They debate such questions as what elemental qualities predominate in each, what are the conditions that determine sex differences, what influence sex has upon the physical structure and the character of animals.³ Every physiognomist offers an exhaustive catalogue of the peculiar attributes of each. The second ps. Aristotle owes much of his material to his master's careful study of sex variations in animals.⁴ Polemo, in turn, is indebted to ps. Aristotle. The unnamed Greek source used by the Latin writer diverges from both in many points. Important differentia of the female that have come from the Aristotelian tradition,⁵ such as γυνήκεα, ἀνευρότερα, ὑγροτέρα σαρκί, are omitted. Many details of the Latin description such as the female's fair complexion, φαῖα and thinner and softer hair, dark eyes, the *ethos* of the face, the three divisions of the body are either neglected by the other writers or differently given. The small and more delicate body, the fair complexion, the *ravior* and *mollior* hair of the female are consistent with Loxus' theory of the blood. The male, on the other hand, has the large head, coarse hair, ruddy complexion, strong frame, and the physical endurance resulting from the opposite state of the blood.

In the psychology of the sexes ps. Aristotle follows his master with a fidelity reflected even in the vocabulary. The female is

¹ Cf. ps. Arist. 14. 5 f., *naturalia et temporalia*.

² Cf. Foster, *Rhein. Mus. f. Phil.*, XLIII, 511. The similarity of a story ascribed by Diog. Laert. vii. 173 to Cleanthes is used as an argument for the date of Loxus. Polemo may have obtained it from a Stoic source. But it appears to be part of a current tradition about the feminine type. Cf. Clemens, *Alex. Paed.* 11, 7, 60, who has collected many curious signs of which this is one. The introduction in which the story occurred in Polemo is lacking in the Arabic version.

³ Cf. on Aristotle, Zeller, *Phil. d. Griech.* II, 2, p. 524 f.; Arist. *G.A.* 763 b 20 f., for views of predecessors.

⁴ *H.A.* iv. 538 b 7 f.; iv. 608 a 21 f.

⁵ Cf. Arist. *H.A.* 538 b 7.

gentler, more easily tamed but less spirited, more impetuous, cowardly, and prone to evil, the male more spirited, courageous, and open. One important female quality is omitted, the *μαθητικώτερον* of Aristotle. Polemo is an uncompromising misogynist. To the black list of Aristotle he adds light-minded, quarrelsome, bitter, and *θρασύδειλον*¹ and to the noble attributes of the male, more patient in adversity and desirous of honor. The Latin writer along with Aristotle ascribes to the female quickness in learning and mental keenness—a keenness allied to craft.² “*Animus est sollers, ad iracundiam pronus, tenax odii, idem immisericors, atque invidus, laboris impatiens, docilis, subdolus, amarus, praeceps, timidus.*”³ The male excels in the spirited qualities and is also more open and fond of honor. The timidity and sagacity of the female and the superior courage of the male are the counterparts to their physical structure required by the psychophysical doctrines of both Loxus and Aristotle. The antipodal qualities of each sex are manifestations of the two opposed physical constitutions defined in their doctrines of the blood.⁴ The mental and spirited qualities are similarly apportioned in the definition of the perfect character Anon. 16. 6—a passage which is linked with Loxus’ name by its resemblance to Anon. 21. 10. Loxus is therefore the most probable source of the anonymous writer’s analysis of sex differences. The later physiognomists, where they have not copied Aristotle, adopt the popular misogynistic tradition.

The Latin writer adds two physiological distinctions between the sexes, that masculine and feminine types produce offspring akin in sex and that the right side of the male body is better developed and the left of the female. These doctrines recall the pre-Aristotelian controversy about the origin of sex recorded in the *History of*

¹ Arist. *Eth.* iii. 5 b 32, a compound not found elsewhere (Burnet, *ad loc.*).

² An opinion reflected in the two fifth-century dramatists who wrote about women as a class; cf. Aristoph. *Thesmophor.* 93, τὸ πρῶγμα κομψὸν καὶ σφόδρ’ ἐκ τοῦ σοῦ τρόπου· τοῦ γὰρ τεχνάζειν ἡμέτερος ὁ πυραμοῦς. *Ibid.*, *Eccles.* 238; Eur. *Andr.* 85., πολλὰς ἂν εὖροις μηχανὰς· γυνὴ γὰρ εἴ.

³ Cf. Aristotle’s psychoanalysis of woman, *H.A.* ix. 608 b 8 f., where he describes her as ἐλεημονέστερον καὶ ἀριδαικνὺν μᾶλλον, ἔτι δὲ φθονερώτερον καὶ μεμφυμοιρότερον καὶ φιλολοιοῖδον μᾶλλον καὶ πληκτικώτερον . . . δυσθυμὸν μᾶλλον. Foster (p. 7) reads *immisericors* after MoC *inmisericors*, *e in alio in misericors*, but LuES write *misericors* which Loxus’ similarity to Aristotle favors.

⁴ Cf. *supra* p. 10; Anon. 20. 11; 16. 5; Arist. *P.A.* 648 a 2 f.

*Animals*¹ and would come most aptly from a medical source. Aristotle held the first view.² The correspondence of sex with the right and left is the foundation of Parmenides' theory of conception.³ In a criticism of the latter Aristotle⁴ remarks that if cold and warm are added as causes the theory has some reason because the right side is warmer than the left and the male warmer than the female. In another passage⁵ where the ideal crasis of the blood midway between the two extremes is described as a good condition for both courage and intelligence it is added that the upper parts have τὴν αὐτὴν διαφορὰν to those below, the male to the female, and the right to the left. In *H.A.* 538 b 2 f. he says explicitly that the upper parts of the male are the stronger and the lower of the female. The same analogy between upper and lower is maintained in Loxus' descriptions of male and female.⁶

The variations of the Latin writer from ps. Aristotle in the historical survey and, particularly, the high regard for the zoological method point, Foster⁷ believes, to Loxus as author. The substitution of the later known Celts⁸ in the survey for the Scythians of ps. Aristotle proves, he argues, the late date of Loxus. The former inference is probably correct. The first ps. Aristotle was skeptical about the accuracy of the zoological method as practiced by his predecessors. The new eclecticism has superseded, in his opinion,

¹ 763 b 20 f. where the curious ideas about sex current at this time are collected.

² *G.A.* 766 b 31.

³ Cf. Diels, *Frag. d. Vorsokr.*, fr. 17: the male is conceived on the right side of the womb, female on the left; cf. Lactant. *de opif. dei* 12. 2, the same theory without name of author. In the definition of male and female qualities he is not unlike Loxus. Censorin. 6. 8 ascribes the doctrine to Anaxagoras and Empedocles but see Arist. *G.A.* 764 a 1. Ps. Pol. 428. 12, a larger left side indicates envy, a quality of the female in Loxus.

⁴ *G.A.* 765 a 34.

⁵ *P.A.* 648 a 2 f.

⁶ Cf. Anon. 10. 7 f. and 9. 8. Different interpretations of this sign are given by ps. Arist. 38. 5; 38. 11; Anon. 134. 3; ps. Pol. 428. 8, larger upper parts indicate fondness for sleep and talkativeness. Anon. 134. 7, upper parts smaller, a sign of good memory.

⁷ *Rhein. Mus. f. Phil.*, XLIII, 510.

⁸ Cf. Arist. *Nic. Eth.* 115 b 28, Celts are proverbial for fearlessness—a passage that goes back probably to Ephoros quoted by Strabo vii, p. 293, where the Cimbri are mentioned along with the Celts. Cf. also Strabo iv. 4. 2–5, Gauls ἀπειμάνιον καὶ θυμικόν and resemble the Germans. Much ἀνόητον and ἀλαζόνικον is mingled in their courage. Pl. *Rep.* 453 E and Arist. *Pol.* 1327 b 23 (following Hipp. *De aere aquis locis* 1. 547 (K) f.) ascribe more θυμός to the northern races.

the obsolete single forms. Modern methods such as that by *ἐπιπρῆεια* and the syllogistic mark the latest advances in this science. The anonymous source, on the contrary, is primarily a zoölogist of the old school, but anticipates the later eclecticism in not abandoning the earlier methods. Arguments for the date based on the races mentioned are of little value. Both writers select their lists from the works of the older ethnologists merely for the purpose of illustration. They make no claim to completeness. Such a historical sketch would represent in any case not the state of knowledge of the historians but of the earlier physiognomists.

The Peripatetic physiognomists added to their art a new and singularly happy method, the composite pictures of familiar types of character. They are the photographic complements of Aristotle's subtle ethical sketches and the witty satires on manners of Theophrastus. Many of the well-known social types sit for their pictures again, the small soul, the shameless, the ironical, and the loquacious. These pictures are found in the work of the first ps. Aristotle, are omitted in the epitome of the second author, and are copied with retouches by Polemo from the former, regardless at times of their harmony with his own outline of the parts. The Latin writer, as he states, preserves the twofold tradition, of Polemo fully, but of ps. Aristotle only in part. All are easily identified with the exception of the second effeminate type which though included among the ps. Aristotelian sketches has many variant features, particularly certain personal mannerisms. For this reason Foster ascribes it to Loxus. Against this conjecture are the explicit statement of the compiler and the uncertainty of the text of the ps. Aristotelian work. It is not unlikely that the epitomist of the latter work in fusing the two books into one omitted duplicated sections. Much positive evidence might be given did it not entail a comparison beyond the compass of the present paper. The Latin collator and ps. Polemo had before them the larger work.

The so-called epilogue contains no definite indication of a source. *Haec exempla* of the first sentence could be used logically by no one but the compiler. The rambling disconnected style of the paragraph and the repetition of sentences from the introduction betray the same hand. Much of the material is to be found in Polemo. The

concurrence of the signs of several animals in one person is discussed by him but different animals are used in illustration.¹ The Latin writer may have desired to connect this after-reflection on the zoölogical method with the version he had just copied by drawing his examples² from the same source. The cautions about the dissembling of character and the confusion of temporary mental states with permanent may be either repetitions from the introduction or reminiscences of Polemo³ and Aristotle.⁴

The attempt of the Latin collator to fuse three books into one treatise is fatal to a precise reconstruction of the work of Loxus. What we have learned from a comparison of the three sources may be briefly summarized. Loxus approached the subject with the scientific bias given by his knowledge of physiology and his observation of animals. The central doctrine upon which his science of physiognomy is built, the location of the soul in the blood, connects him with Empedocles and the Sicilian school of medicine. In the application of this doctrine to the perfect temperament and to the differentiation of sex he anticipates, in part, the more advanced psychology of Aristotle. Loxus, therefore, must antedate ps. Aristotle, who not only borrows from Aristotle but also adopts a theory of the temperaments not developed until a much later period. Traces of his influence upon the later physiognomists may be discovered in the interpretation of the signs of the hair and several traditions preserved in the descriptions of typical characters. It is idle to try to determine the exact date of Loxus from the few authentic fragments. For the closest counterparts to his physiological doctrines we must look to the medical literature of the fifth century. His apparent ignorance of doctrines prevailing in the fourth-century schools of medicine excludes a date later than the first half of that century.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, CANADA

¹ Cf. Adam. 305. 4 (no examples given); Arab. 119. 16.

² The malignitas of the simia agrees with Loxus' zoölogy but not the insolentia of the horse. Cf. rather Adam. 400. 6; horse is αἰθρίας τε καὶ ἀπειθής καὶ ὑβριστής.

³ Adam. 397. 10 f.; Anon. 75. 7; 94. 12; Arab. 256. 10 a full study of *simulatio*.

⁴ P. 14, 5 f.

THE DOUBLING OF RÔLES IN ROMAN COMEDY

BY HENRY W. PRESCOTT

In various articles I have called attention to a prevailing weakness, as it seems to me, in the current interpretation of Roman comedy. Starting from an assumption of an exaggerated amount of dependence upon Euripidean tragedy, scholars are prone to ascribe to Hellenistic comedy a relatively faultless form and structure. Then, analyzing Roman comedies, these same scholars when they find in the Latin plays various structural weaknesses are quick to stamp such defects as the botchwork of the Roman adapters. In view of our ignorance of the antecedents of Hellenistic comedy, and considering the scanty remains of the Greek type, this procedure is reckless. And it completely ignores the fact that every dramatist, Greek or Roman, faces difficulties imposed by a variety of conditions, external and internal, the stage and scene setting, traditional conventions, and the exigencies of the plot. Few dramatists, even of the best Greek period, may hope to obviate these difficulties without occasional lapses.

From a layman's standpoint a dramatist would seem to be laboring under a very serious handicap if his play must be produced by a company of actors smaller than the number of characters demanded by his plot. As a matter of fact this limitation is not so serious as it seems. The natural interlocking of the chapters of action in a given plot and the consequent alternation of groups of persons in a series of successive scenes often permit a doubling of rôles without any awkwardness and without any manifest structural blemishes. But here and there the playwright is likely to disclose himself in the act of manipulating action to facilitate the change of rôles.

But what evidence have we that ancient drama was produced by limited casts? In his doctoral dissertation¹ Rees attacked the validity of the rule of three actors in the classical drama of the fifth century, and reached the conclusion (p. 76) that "it seems unlikely that the habit of doubling parts existed to any great extent, if at all."

¹ *The So-called Rule of Three Actors in the Classical Greek Drama*, Chicago, 1908. Cf. also *Class. Phil.*, V (1910), 291 ff.; *Amer. Jour. Phil.*, XXXI (1910), 43 ff.

He then provides distributions of rôles for certain selected Greek plays of the fifth century, in each case offering, first, a possible distribution of the rôles among three actors; secondly, a distribution among more than three but always for fewer than the characters of the given play. I infer that Rees is willing to admit that fifth-century Greek dramas may have been produced by limited casts if not by troupes of only three actors. In the Hellenistic period Rees finds evidence that at that time traveling companies and guilds of actors did furnish only three actors for the production of a play, and his general conclusion is that a practice cultivated in the later period led to the inculcation of a rule which was incorrectly applied to the drama of the fifth century.

When we turn to the Roman drama we find ourselves without any of the external evidence which is available to students of the Greek drama for the study of the doubling of rôles. One bit of explicit internal evidence does not carry us very far. The speaker of the prologue of Plautus' *Poenulus*, verses 123, 126, announces that he must retire to assume another rôle, but from this passage we may only infer that the rôle of the *prologus* fell to an actor who filled some other rôle or rôles in the subsequent play. Nevertheless, the general acceptance of the rule of three actors in Greek drama long ago led students of Roman comedy to consider the possibility of the doubling of rôles in the Latin plays, although it was evident that any limitation to three actors was impossible in the Roman productions; and in 1870 Schmidt¹ worked out on this assumption schemes of distribution in the various plays of Plautus and Terence which provided for their being presented by companies of from three to seven actors. The normal number of characters in a Latin comedy is about twelve or thirteen. Without stopping to criticize Schmidt for his purely mechanical methods and his absolute neglect of many important factors, we may simply agree with Hauler² that such an essay indicates that the plays of Plautus and Terence *could* have been presented by limited casts of actors. In 1910 I published a brief paper in the *Harvard Studies*³ in which I endeavored to prove that certain

¹ *Über die Zahl der Schauspieler bei Plautus und Terenz*, Erlangen, 1870.

² Dziatzko-Hauler, *Phormio*⁴, p. 40, n. 3.

³ *Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.*, XXI (1910), 31 ff.

peculiarities in the structure of three plays of Plautus could only be explained on the basis that these three plays *must* have been produced by a limited cast. For my present purpose I must immodestly assume that students of comedy, like the two or three reviewers of that paper, are convinced that the *Captivi*, the *Miles Gloriosus*, and the *Pseudolus* were certainly produced by companies of actors smaller in number than the characters in the given play. To the article in the *Harvard Studies*¹ I added a few suggestions based on what I called secondary evidence. The argument for the three plays in question did not rest on hypotheses or presuppositions of any sort, but the appended suggestions regarding other plays issued from the condition, "if other plays were produced by a limited cast," and resulted in the conclusion that certain structural peculiarities were then necessitated by the limitation in the number of available actors.

The Roman plays furnish such secondary evidence of the distribution of rôles rather abundantly. But it is logically unsatisfactory so long as we beg the question at issue as a preliminary to the use of it. The devices which a playwright will use if he is hampered by the necessity of employing a small troupe of actors are very easily imagined. If the troupe is limited to four actors, the dramatist may arrange a series of chapters or scenes in which A and B converse in the first scene, C and D in the second, and A and B in the third, but such an alternation is not likely to be agreeable to him throughout the play, and becomes impossible so soon as he wishes to increase the number of characters in a dialogue to three or more. Then he is driven to one or both of two devices that are quite obvious, although he may have others at his disposal that are not so easily imagined. If he has a dialogue between A, B, and C in the first scene, he must arrange an early exit of one of these three before the end of the scene in order that A or B or C in a different rôle may appear with D in a second scene; or he may retire both A and B before the end of the scene, leaving C on stage with a monologue, and then provide for the return of A and B in the second scene in different rôles and for their dialogue with C in this subsequent scene. In brief, the early exit or the monologue, or both, are the most available means of facilitating change of rôles.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 47 ff.

The pages of the Latin plays are thickly strewn with monologues, and early exits are not infrequent, but it would be absurd to use these, independently of other criteria, as evidence of the change of rôles. For clearly these same features of technique serve other purposes than merely easing the difficulties of doubling rôles, and it is seldom possible to assure ourselves that an early exit or a monologue is primarily and exclusively a device to promote a change of rôles. It is desirable, however, to corroborate, if possible, this a priori contention that early exits and monologues are natural tricks of the playwright in overcoming the economic inconveniences of a limited cast. On pages 71 ff. of his thesis Rees mentioned the existence of a considerable number of early English dramatic pieces, miracle plays, moralities, and interludes, which are designated for production by small troupes of actors. In fact, the title-pages of original or early editions of these English plays state, with slight variations of the formula, that the given play may be produced by such-and-such a number of players, the number regularly considerably smaller than the number of characters in the play. Rees, however, neglected to report the much more important fact that these title-pages not infrequently state just how the rôles may be distributed among the actors of the small troupe. The validity of these title-pages I am not competent to discuss. In a small number of cases the statements are incorrect.¹ And it is not to be hastily inferred that the playwright wrote his play always for a troupe of the particular size mentioned on the title-page. Conceivably such statements on the title-pages are sometimes, if not always, advertising media to encourage the production of the plays by strolling companies smaller than the established troupes.² But in any case the English plays which state the

¹ As noted, for example, by Greg in his edition of Phillip's *The Play of Patient Grisell* (Malone Society Reprints, 1909), pp. xiii-xiv. And in *Wealth and Health* ("Early English Dramatists," *Lost Tudor Plays*, pp. 275 ff.) the advertisement that four may play the piece is controverted by the conditions on pp. 297, 298 ff., 299, where more than four are on stage.

² Students of English drama seem not to recognize the possibility of appreciating various peculiarities of dramatic structure through a study of the plays advertised as presentable by a limited cast. Professor John M. Manly, of the University of Chicago, has recently assigned the task to a graduate student, and the recent correspondence in the *London Times Literary Supplement* for August 22, 1919 (p. 449), January 30, 1920 (p. 69), February 6 (p. 86), February 13 (p. 105), indicates a growing interest in the subject, though such interest seems to be more in the direction of stage antiqui-

precise distribution of rôles are immediately available for the purpose of discovering what features of dramatic technique are peculiarly characteristic of dramas that may be produced under the handicap of a limited cast. And they are helpful in testing the validity of criteria in common use among students of the classical dramas. Rees,¹ for example, as a preliminary to his constructive schemes for the distribution of rôles in selected Greek plays, lays down certain guiding principles: (1) the combination of male and female rôles is to be avoided; (2) only characters of like age should be grouped; (3) important characters in a play require separate actors for each, etc. Such rules may seem sensible, but they are purely subjective and certainly discount heavily the versatility and endurance of Greek actors of the fifth century. The general likelihood of such principles could be easily confirmed or corrected from the English plays. And similarly, such an elusive factor as the so-called "harmony of rôles," which rests on the supposition that two rôles with similar mental, moral, or physical qualities were played by one actor, might be tested in these documents.

For our present purposes it is sufficient to note that an analysis of half a dozen of the English plays reveals that almost the only obvious mechanical device recurring in these dramas designated for production by a small company, and with the distribution of rôles expressly indicated on the title-page, is the early exit or monologue, or both, arranged so as to permit the return of the actor who makes the early exit in a different rôle after the monologue.² That is, if

ties and of textual tradition than of dramatic technique. Brandl, *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare* (1898), pp. xxxiii, xlv, lv, lxvii, lxxxvii, xcvi, cxviii, comments on the matter in connection with the plays published in that volume.

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 76-77.

² The wide range of the monologue may be illustrated from an analysis of one play, *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom* ("Early English Dramatists," *Five Anonymous Plays*, fourth series, pp. 259 ff.). If one follows the division of rôles on the title-page, (1) the monologue of Idleness, p. 271, allows Nurture to appear as Catch; (2) the monologue of Idleness, p. 277, allows Snatch to appear as Honest Recreation; (3) the early exit of Honest Recreation, p. 279, allows two lines for a change to the rôle of Irksomeness; (4) the monologue of Idleness, p. 283, allows Wit to appear as Search; (5) on p. 288, unless there is a vacant stage and interval, the monologue of Idleness gives Fancy an opportunity to assume the rôle of Doll. On the other hand, observe on p. 292 that, unless there is a vacant stage and interval, the assertion on the title-page that the

one accepts the distribution of rôles provided by the title-page and then follows the action of the play, early exit and monologue are almost the only features by which the playwright shows his hand in manipulating the structure to meet the exigency of a limited cast. Other devices which he may have employed are usually hidden from the modern reader.¹ It is also to be noted that this combination of early exit and monologue appears not infrequently in the English plays at stages of the action where it cannot have any connection with the doubling of rôles. Any application, therefore, of the principle to the Latin plays must be made with extreme caution. If one has determined by other criteria a possible and plausible doubling of rôles in a Latin play, an observation of the use of early exit and monologue in the context where the characters appear may confirm the possibility; or sometimes, one may decide between alternative possibilities by watching for the use of early exit and monologue in appropriate chapters of the action. As cumulative and corrective evidence this new criterion is helpful.

Before illustrating by a few concrete examples the cautious use of this kind of evidence, we must note two other criteria of a negative sort that are quite obvious and indispensable. The first is generally accepted and formed the basis, almost exclusively, of Schmidt's mechanical assignment of rôles. It is the principle of coincident appearances. Obviously, characters appearing together in any scene may not be played by the same actor. The second principle is not employed by Schmidt, although I am convinced that it is equally obvious and necessary. Unless there are pauses in the action, we must also eliminate the possibility that character A, on stage at the end of one scene, may appear immediately as character B at the beginning of the next scene. This negative principle of successive appearances at once raises the problem of act-division and the

same actor plays Good Nurture and Lob must be wrong, for these two characters here make successive appearances. And finally, note that the monologue of Idleness, p. 294, has no relation to the change of rôles.

¹ Of course, intervening dialogue also promotes change of rôles; so, for example, in *Patient Grissell* (ed. McKerrow-Greg, Malone Society Reprints), lines 1743-86, a dialogue between Janicle and Grissell, allow Reason and Sobriety, who make their exit before it, to reappear as Patience and Constance after it, in accord with the doubling provided on the title-page.

question whether in the Latin plays appreciable pauses in the action, corresponding to the modern curtain-fall, marked off chapters of the dramatic action. It is quite clear that the structure of the Latin plays often reveals survivals of act-division in the Greek originals, even if such act-divisions were not marked in the Greek plays by vacant stages and pauses. But there is abundant evidence that the Latin plays themselves were designed to be produced continuously without pauses in the action. Cases such as that in *Cist.* 630, where Melaenis makes her exit at the end of one scene and reappears immediately at the beginning of the next, are very rare. On the other hand, the whole structure of the Latin plays, even if we admit a few exceptional conditions, points in the direction of continuous action.¹ And in any case, nobody contends that between successive scenes within an act there were any pauses in the action. The principle of successive appearances, therefore, eliminates the possibility of doubling under the given conditions.

Our procedure in determining a possible distribution of rôles must, consequently, start with purely negative results based on these two principles. We are then left with certain positive possibilities of doubling, which may often be tested and further delimited by observing the use of early exit and monologue at points in the action where the two characters whom we suspect of being carried by one actor appear in close succession. To illustrate the method and its results, I naturally limit myself to the three plays, the *Captivi*, the *Pseudolus*, and the *Miles Gloriosus*, which were intended for production by limited casts, if the arguments of my earlier paper are convincing.

Quite unconscious of the wide use of early exit or monologue or both as devices to facilitate change of rôles, I made incidental references in the article in *Harvard Studies* to these features of technique in the scenes which I was employing to prove production by a limited cast. So, in the *Pseudolus*, the monologue of the *puer* at 767 ff. was justified only as a device to allow Pseudolus, who appeared before it, to play the rôle of the cook in the scene after the monologue; and

¹ Cf. Conrad, *The Technique of Continuous Action in Roman Comedy*, 1915, for general evidence, and pp. 72 ff. for the few passages that may seem to interfere with a denial of act-division and essential pause.

having established that point, I then noted the confirmation of it in the fact that the cook scene itself concludes with an early exit of the cook and a monologue by Ballio, 892 ff., which are obviously devised to provide for the cook, in the interval 892-904, to reappear as Pseudolus in 905.¹ But if we turn from this interesting group of scenes to the rest of the play, we are impressed by conditions which emphasize the need of extreme caution in using the early exit or monologue as evidence of change of rôles. For the play is strewn with monologues, almost none of which, with the exception of the two just noted, have any bearing on the doubling of rôles; they contribute rather to the characterization of Pseudolus and to the general economy of exposition and action. The structure often makes specific doublings possible but seldom confirms them as inevitable. So, for example, the long solo parts of *Pseudolus*, 561-93, would permit either Simo or Callipho, who make their exits at 560-61, to reappear as Harpax at 594; since Simo is elsewhere on stage with Harpax, the doubling of Callipho and Harpax is the only possibility. Such facts are always worth noting. For at any moment, in combination with other facts, they may prove decisive, but not in this instance.

Similarly, in the case of the *Captivi*, there is little more to be gleaned from an observation of early exits and monologues. The plot is so constructed that, in combination with the small number of characters, the problem of doubling rôles does not drive the author to the use of any obviously mechanical devices until he approaches the conclusion of his play. Then, needing to bring on stage almost all the characters of the action, he reveals, in the scene immediately preceding the last act, his method of surmounting the difficulties. And again, the monologue of the *puer*, preceded by the exit of Ergasilus, permits the doubling of Ergasilus' rôle with one of the four characters who appear at 922, presumably with Stalagmus.² It may be added that the dialogue in this last act between 953 and 998 permits Philopolemus, who leaves at 953, to act the rôle of Tyndarus at 998. Thus the scheme proposed by Schmidt, on the basis of coincident appearances, is confirmed as very probable, though not quite inevitable, through a study of the structure, with the single exception that the doubling of Philocrates and the *puer* is impossible

¹ *Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.*, XXI (1910), 39-45.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 37-39.

unless there was a pause in the action at 921. For here the exit of the *puer* immediately precedes the entrance of Philocrates. And any pause is quite impossible in this place, since such a pause would make altogether unnecessary the use of early entrance and monologue before 922 to facilitate change of rôles.

The *Miles Gloriosus* illustrates more happily than the other two plays how far beyond Schmidt's mechanical distribution of rôles we may advance by a thoughtful observation of features of technique in combination with other factors. Again, as in the *Captivi*, the last act of the play calls for the full strength of the troupe of actors, in this case five in number. And before the final scene the dramatist is easily detected in manipulating the action. In my previous article I called attention to the suspiciously sudden intrusion of the *puer* just before this final scene, a *puer* who never elsewhere appears in the play, and who, moreover, in this case plays the part of go-between in the relations of the soldier with the imaginary wife of Periplectomenus, although in the preceding action this rôle of go-between has been consistently played by another character, Milphidippa. I drew the conclusion that this sudden intrusion of the *puer* was due to the necessity of having the actor who played Milphidippa appear in the last scene in a different rôle. Under this condition, obviously, Milphidippa could not appear in her regular rôle immediately before this final scene, and the *puer* was substituted. I then attached in a footnote a few observations regarding the early exit of certain characters in the scene that precedes the dialogue between the *puer* and the soldier.¹ These observations become now much more important, especially if they are studied in relation to other parts of this play.

The situation is briefly this: At 1311 there begins a dialogue in which Palaestrio, Philocomasium, Pyrgopolinices, and Pleusicles take part. The scheme of Schmidt, based on coincident appearances, provides a troupe of five actors for this play. We have then all the most exigent conditions that could confront a playwright operating with a limited cast. For not only does his last scene require the entire cast, but the action immediately preceding that last scene requires all but one of his available actors. He can, therefore, hardly

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 34-36, nn. 2 and 3.

avoid showing his hand. It is worth noting at the outset that, as would be expected under the circumstances, only one character appears in both of these two scenes, the soldier Pyrgopolinices. The devices to meet the difficulties emerge at the end of the first of the two scenes in question. Two of the four characters retire at 1353, Pleusicles and Philocomasium. Palaestrio then retires at 1373. Thus three actors are released. A brief dialogue ensues between Pyrgopolinices and the *puer*, 1374-93, and the five characters of the last scene, all but one of them differing from the four in the preceding action, appear for the last act. It is quite obvious that these early exits of Philocomasium, Pleusicles, and Palaestrio provide for their appearing in the rôles of Periplectomenus, Cario, Sceledrus, and the Lorarius in the final scene. And inasmuch as the *puer* scene has been explained as a device to release Milphidippa for a rôle in the last scene, we have four actors free to play four parts in the final act, the fifth rôle in that scene, Pyrgopolinices, continuing from the previous action.

All that remains to be done is to discover what specific rôles were doubled. Since Cario and the Lorarius do not appear elsewhere in the play, we are not likely to discover from the technique elsewhere just which rôles were combined in those two cases. But Periplectomenus and Sceledrus do appear in the earlier action, and the technique in the neighborhood of scenes in which they are on stage may be illuminating. So, for example, we observe that at 585 Sceledrus retires, in 586-95 Periplectomenus delivers a monologue, then in 596-609 Palaestrio soliloquizes, after which Pleusicles appears in 610. Clearly this permits, though it does not make inevitable, the doubling of the rôles of Pleusicles and Sceledrus, and this doubling is also permitted by the structure which we have just described at the end of the play.

Starting, therefore, from this mere possibility of one actor's carrying the rôles of Sceledrus and Pleusicles, we look for confirmatory evidence. The two characters never appear together on the stage. But for positive evidence we turn to the much discussed Lurcio scene at 813 ff. The striking features of this scene may be briefly summarized.¹ In the previous action the slave, Sceledrus, belonging

¹ Cf. *Class. Phil.*, XV (1920), 264 ff., for a fuller statement.

to the household of the soldier, has brought about complications by discovering the presence of Philocomasium in the house of the next-door neighbor. Sceledrus, however, has been persuaded by a trick that his eyes really deceived him; he must have seen a twin sister of Philocomasium. Much discomfited by this apparent proof that he has made a great disturbance over nothing, he retired in 585 to the soldier's house. At the beginning of our present scene, 813 ff., another slave, Palaestrio, stands before the soldier's house and calls Sceledrus out; we expect Sceledrus to appear, but in his place there emerges a slave-boy or butler, Lurcio, whom we have never heard of before in the action, and who never appears again, and a dialogue of rough wit ensues between Palaestrio and Lurcio, which manifestly has no function except that of entertaining the audience with a vaudeville interlude. We naturally inquire why Sceledrus was not allowed to appear and play the rôle of entertainer. Why should the dramatist suddenly lug on a character of whom he makes no further use in the play? Knowing the limitations imposed upon a playwright by a small cast, it is at least proper to inquire if the explanation lies in that direction. The necessity of suddenly creating Lurcio in a rôle and in action that Sceledrus would naturally carry arises immediately if any of the characters in the preceding scene were played by the same actor who played Sceledrus. In that case, since this actor cannot make an exit at the end of the previous scene and immediately reappear in a different rôle, the invention of a substitute for Sceledrus becomes imperative. Now the character who does retire at the very end of the previous scene is Pleusicles, and we may find in the conditions that are so peculiar in the Lurcio scene confirmation of the view that Sceledrus and Pleusicles were played by the same actor.¹

In brief, from the structure of three different portions of the play, we infer the doubling of the rôles of these two characters. No one of these three structural features would by itself be sufficient to

¹ The summons in vss. 813-17, delivered by Palaestrio, might give Pleusicles sufficient time to assume the rôle of Lurcio; Pleusicles retires at 812 and Lurcio appears at 818. Schmidt accordingly assigns Pleusicles, Lurcio, and Sceledrus to one actor. This passage, however, is much shorter than those which usually provide for change of rôles; cf. *Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.*, XXI (1910), 44. If the argument above is sound, it prevents the doubling of Lurcio and Sceledrus.

prove the point, but I think the combination of the three is somewhat more than an accumulation of three weak bits of evidence resulting in an altogether weak conclusion. It is also important to note that two of the portions involved in the argument are often used to support a theory of contamination for the *Miles Gloriosus*. The theorists never reckon with the possibility that doubling of rôles may explain more easily awkward structure than do their own theories of contamination. My main purpose, however, has been simply to illustrate some desirable methods that may carry us beyond the mechanical analysis based merely on coincident appearances, and my own ultimate interest is not in the likelihood that Sceledrus and Pleusicles were played by the same actor, but that certain features of the form of comedy are immediately understood and appreciated when we recognize the inevitable effects upon dramatic technique of a doubling of rôles and a limited cast.¹

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ It is important to observe the large part played by the monologue in facilitating change of rôles. The monologue seems to replace, in this respect, the chorus of Greek drama. Cf. *Class. Phil.*, XIV (1919), 116, n. 1, 117, 123.

THE POET KAT' ΕΞΟΧΗΝ

BY A. M. HARMON

It has long been generally held that Homer was *the* poet to the Greeks, and that when they said ὁ ποιητής without naming any specific poet or otherwise limiting the expression, they meant Homer. This article of faith has recently been impugned, and for the third time, by Professor Scott, who declares: "It is perfectly evident that the Greeks had no feeling for any one poet in the use of this phrase, and that the sentence used in Harper's Dictionary under the word *Homerus*, 'Homer was to them "the poet" (ὁ ποιητής) in a special sense,' does not state the facts."¹ This declaration, put forth not as a casual opinion, to be taken for whatever it might be worth, but as the upshot of a careful study of the matter, seems to me so far from perfectly evident, so little justified by the facts as I see them, that I cannot withhold myself from challenging it in the sharpest of terms.

In the first place, the observation of which he denies the validity does not originate with the authors of modern handbooks, but with the Greeks themselves. It is stated *disertis verbis* in two passages quoted in the *Paris Stephanus*, and therefore not readily to be overlooked by any investigator. Plutarch says: "Though there are many poets, we give the name of poet specially to one, the mightiest (ἕνα τὸν κράτιστον ἐξαιρέτως ποιητὴν καλοῦμεν—*Moral.*, 667 F). Therein he is borne out by Galen: "Inasmuch as men are accustomed sometimes to call things that are most prominent in a class by the name of the class, just as when they remark that this line was said by 'the poet,' and this by 'the poetess.' We all understand that 'poet' means Homer and 'poetess' Sappho" (καθάπερ ὅταν εἰπωσιν ὑπὸ μὲν τοῦ ποιητοῦ λελέχθαι τόδε τὸ ἔπος, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς ποιητρίας τόδε πάντες γὰρ ἀκούομεν "Ὅμηρον μὲν λέγεσθαι ποιητὴν, Σαπφῶ δὲ ποιητριαν—Kühn iv. 771; *Script. Min.* ii, p. 35, Teubner). These are not idle speculations; each writer is bearing direct evidence to the existence

¹ *Classical Journal*, XVII (1922), 330; cf. *ibid.*, XVI (1921), 367, and *Unity of Homer*, pp. 21-22.

of the usage in his own times. And in both cases the weight of the testimony is enhanced by the fact that the observation is not made for its own sake, but as an illustration, which would have been worse than pointless if the usage appealed to as parallel did not really exist.

Secondly, even if the ancients themselves had not called our attention to its existence, we should have had ample reason, in my opinion, to deduce from the actual practice of extant authors the conclusion that a great number of Greeks for a very long time spoke of Homer as "the poet" and understood Homer to be meant when "the poet" was mentioned.

The usage, then, is genuine as can be; the only proper question in regard to it is of its duration and extent.

The testimony of Aristophanes and Demosthenes, if it were of the positive value that Professor Scott's presentation would incline one to ascribe to it, would at the utmost only go to show that the Attic writers and the Athenian public did not recognize Homer as "the poet." But really it has only negative significance, and not a great deal of that, since in Aristophanes Homer is mentioned by name only seven times in the extant plays and once in the fragments, and as for Demosthenes, there are but two Homeric references in the whole corpus.¹ Neither Aristophanes nor Demosthenes contains anything that has any claim to be considered a contravention of the idiom to which Plutarch and Galen testify. To be sure, in *Acharnians*, *Knights*, and *Wasps* the chorus of Aristophanes, in "coming forward," as they call it, in "the anapests," to address the audience directly as the mouthpiece of the playwright, observes a precedent of anonymity by designating him, *inter alia*, as "the poet." But this has no bearing upon the point at issue. The circumstances themselves under which the designation is employed limit its application. Even Galen and his friends could not have misunderstood: "Now then, good people, give us your attention, if you appreciate straight talk, for the poet has a bone to pick with the spectators" (*Wasps* 1016). Apart from this narrowly restricted practice, "the poet" in Aristophanes is always a definite individual; the application of the phrase is always limited by a name or in some other way. We need not examine the passages, as they have not been adduced by Pro-

¹ *Epitaphius* 29 (to the *Iliu Persis*, by the way), and *Eroticus* 25.

fessor Scott and differ in no wise from those in Demosthenes, which, since they have been adduced specifically, I cannot permit myself to pass over with the bare statement that they are not in point. In 19. 244, alluding to a famous passage of Hesiod which he has just quoted, or rather repeated from Aeschines (*Timarch.* 129, where the author was named), he remarks: "We have your own word for it that . . . the poet who wrote these lines was wise" (ὁ ποιητὴς ὁ ταῦτα γράψας). If Demosthenes had feared being misunderstood by hearers who would think "the poet" meant Homer, he could not have guarded his utterance more carefully. A little farther on in the same oration (247) we find: "The Antigone of Sophocles . . . in this play . . . the poet," and then a quotation, naturally from the Antigone of Sophocles. In 331, and again in 59. 26 we find a man spoken of as "Xenocleides, the poet." These are the facts, and presumably all the facts; for according to Preuss there are in Demosthenes no other instances of the word "poet" in the singular. That this sort of thing has nothing at all to do with the case may be made abundantly, no doubt superfluously, clear by an illustration. In the mouth or on the pen of an Englishman "the King," unqualified in any way, means the reigning monarch. It is as a rule a definite, personal allusion, and cannot be used to refer to any other person. Yet any Englishman without fear of being misunderstood, can say "Constantine, the king," or when Greece is under discussion, "the king who formerly ruled that country was wise" (if he thinks so), or, after Greece and Constantine have been mentioned, simply "the King."

For all that Aristophanes and Demosthenes, taken by themselves, prove, even the Athenian public can have recognized Homer as "the poet." But did they? Probably not. The weight of negative evidence becomes considerable if, as I think, we must add to it the fragments of comedy, the rest of the orators, and the historians Thucydides and Xenophon. Certainly their prevailing practice, when they want to adduce a poet, whether Homer or another, is to give his name. But for my part I do not know of any positive evidence in these writers, or any reference in them to "the poet." With Plato and Aristotle the case is very different. Plato does occasionally ascribe quotations to "the poet," and cannot thereby

mean Homer because the citations are not always from him; the phrase is therefore in Plato indefinite. This was proved by Langbein in 1911.¹ Among the passages handled by him there are four, and I think only four, clean-cut examples, in two of which the poet quoted is Homer (*Gorg.* 485 D, *Laws* vii. 803 E), in one, Hesiod (*Laws* x. 901 A, previously brought up by Professor Scott), and in the fourth an unknown poet, surely lyric (*Meno* 77 B).² In Aristotle also "the poet" has quotations ascribed to him, and much more frequently than in Plato; but here too one must agree with Langbein that it is still an indefinite expression. In the more authentic treatises I find no case where, used to introduce a quotation from Homer, it seems at all surely instinct with personality, and there are at least five cases where the reference is not to Homer at all.³ Such contraventions of the usage mentioned by Plutarch and Galen show conclusively that it was foreign to the immediate circles of Plato and Aristotle, and go far to elevate into a certainty the inference deducible from the negative testimony of the other Attic writers, that it was foreign to the Athenian public as a whole. But let us not conclude that therefore it must have been foreign to all Greeks of all time.

In passing from his two Athenians to Dio and Lucian, Professor Scott overleaps approximately half a millennium of Hellenistic literature. Therein we cannot follow him; for it is precisely in this period that the practice of which he denies the existence flourishes like the green bay tree. Homer, who already in Plato was in a fair way to become *the* poet (*Ion* 530 B, *Laws* vi. 776 E), has at last come into his own, and the phrase which in Plato was indefinite has now become definite; it is now "the Poet," and means Homer.

In the pseudo-Aristotelian "Book of Marvels," the *Mirabiles Auscultationes*, Homer twice receives his due. The prettiest example (839 b 30) runs: "They say . . . using the Poet himself as a wit-

¹ Guil. Langbein, *de Platonis ratione poetas laudandi*, Jena, 1911, p. 53.

² In *Alcib.* ii. 147 B, not mentioned by Langbein, the allusion to "the poet" in connection with a citation from the *Margites* seems to me to have a definite personal cast, in spite of the fact that Socrates subsequently explains that Homer was the poet in question. He might have felt called upon to do this either for the sake of emphasis, or because the idiom was not yet firmly established, or for both reasons at once.

³ *Eth. Nicom.* 1154 b 28 (Euripides), *Rhet.* 1371 b 31 Roemer (Euripides), *Pol.* 1260 a 29 (Sophocles), *Probl.* 879 a 28 (Hesiod), *Phys.* 194 a 30 (trimeter of unknown origin).

ness in those regions" (αὐτῷ τῷ ποιητῇ ἐν ἐκείνοις τοῖς τόποις μάρτυρι χρώμενοι). The personification would be clear even without the pronoun, which but makes assurance doubly sure; and the allusion is absolutely out of a clear sky. In fact, Homer's name is not mentioned anywhere in the book. In the only other allusion to his writings he is once more "the Poet."¹

The date of the author of this treatise is uncertain; possibly he is later than Posidonius. But it is not because of his own earliness that I quote him first. Examination of those two passages in their context will, I think, bring conviction that certainly in the first and probably in the second the expression is taken over from the writer's source, which in each case is believed upon good reason to be Timaeus.² This conclusion finds strong support in two passages from Polybius where Timaeus is quoted by name, and although in the indirect form, clearly with great fidelity. One of them (12, 26, 3-5) is priceless; παρὰ μὲν τῷ ποιητῇ introduces a couple of citations from Homer, and then—as if the μὲν had not been enough to point the contrast between "the Poet" and the authority to be quoted next—the sentence continues: ὁμογνωμονεῖν δὲ τῷ ποιητῇ καὶ τὸν Εὐριπίδην ἐν οἷς φησιν κτλ. "The Poet says thus and so, and Euripides agrees with the Poet!" Moreover, in 12, 24, 2 "the Poet" is set off against Aristotle. Either Polybius thrice substituted the title for the name, or Timaeus gave signal recognition to the usage.

This brings us to Polybius himself, whose practice is worth examining in some detail. According to the Index Scriptorum in Büttner-Wobst, Euripides is cited five times, Hesiod three, Epicharmus twice, Pindar, Simonides, and Stasinus (?) once each. Polybius had in all, then, thirteen chances to attribute to "the Poet" a quotation from some other member of the guild than Homer; but he does not once avail himself of the opportunity. On the other hand he introduces Homer out of a clear sky no less than thirteen times as "the Poet" and only four times by name.³ To be sure, of the thirteen instances,

¹ With regard to the Daunian women, to whose descent from the Trojans he has just referred, he says: πάνυ δὲ καὶ τῷ ποιητῇ καλῶς πέφρασται περὶ αὐτῶν" ἔλκεσιπέπλους γὰρ καὶ βαθυκόλπους κάκεινας, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἰδεῖν ἔστιν (840 b 15).

² Cf. Müller, *F.H.G.* i. Timaeus 5 and 6, and 14.

³ Five times we find a bare "literary" quotation or reminiscence without reference to the source; and in 38. 21. 1, where the fragmentary text has only παρὰ, it is not surprising that the editor fills it out with τῷ ποιητῇ.

seven are formulaic (κατὰ τὸν ποιητὴν 3. 94. 4; 4. 45. 6; 9. 21; 12. 21. 3; 15. 12. 9; 15. 16. 3; τὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ 34. 14. 8); but that they are not felt as indefinite is obvious both because they are actually restricted to Homer and because none of the other six is formulaic and some of them show clearly that to Polybius the designation was as good as a name. For example, in 12. 27. 10, after mention of Ephorus and Theopompus, he says: *ἐπεὶ δὲ τούτων ἐμφαντικώτερον ὁ ποιητὴς εἴρηκε περὶ τούτου τοῦ μέρους. ἐκείνος γὰρ κτλ.*¹

Between Polybius and Diodorus Siculus the fashion has not changed in poets. Of ten Homeric allusions in the first book of Diodorus, six are to "the Poet," and one to τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον τῶν παρ' Ἑλλήσι ποιητῶν (12. 2; cf. 3. 2. 3).

Strabo says of the Euxine (1, 2. 10): "It was thought to be the greatest of the seas in our neighborhood, and for that reason they (the men of Homer's day) gave to it especially the name of Pontus par excellence, just as they gave the name of poet to Homer." In 1. 2. 20 he deplores any attempt to withhold from Homer τὸ πρεσβεῖον in any field, particularly geography. In 3. 2. 12 and 14. 2. 28—to mention only two instances out of many—he makes it abundantly clear that to him "the Poet" means Homer.

That the idiom is not confined to historians and geographers, a handful of random gleanings will show. In the treatise *On Style* attributed to Demetrius of Phalerum "the Poet" is contrasted with Thucydides in 113, and in 133 we find the remark: "expressions which are peculiar to the Poet." The Stoic philosopher Cornutus quotes Hesiod five times by name, Homer only thrice by name and five times by his title. The grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus, writing on Pronouns (72 C), in one breath quotes Pindar, then "the Poet," then Sophron. Both Plutarch and Galen confirm their previously noted precept by their practice. Plutarch, for instance, in *Conj. Praecept.* 38 (143 D) first cites a text from Euripides, and after brief exposition adds: "The Poet too conveys the same moral when he makes Hera say," etc. For Galen also a single instance (Kühn xv, p. 19) will serve: "the word *πάμπαν* is manifestly used in this sense both by the Poet where he says"—here follows a quotation from Homer—"and by Hippocrates himself where he says"—here a

¹ Cf. 9. 16. 1; 12. 25¹, 1; 34. 2. 10; 34. 4. 2; 34. 11. 20.

quotation from Hippocrates. Sextus Empiricus observes (Bekker, p. 20, 23): "Therefore the poets also have declared themselves adequately on this matter; for Pindar says . . . and the Poet says . . . Nay, even tragedy is full of such declarations." One finds, too, that Christians as well as pagans burned incense at Homer's shrine. Hippolytus in the *Refutation of all Heresies* contributes his grain and thereby undesignedly helps to refute a heresy that he did not know of; for he speaks of Homer four times as "the Poet" and calls him but thrice by name. It would be a mistake to assume that this is because he does not quote anybody else.

Such evidence as this cannot be reconciled with any theory that "the poet" was always and everywhere an indefinite locution; that it occurs so frequently in connection with references to Homer simply because Homer is so frequently quoted; and that the Greeks had no feeling for Homer in its use. To employ it of Homer in a perfectly definite, personal sense was an idiom centuries old in the time of Plutarch and Galen, and in their day universally understood. It was not, however, universally employed.

Dio Chrysostom and Lucian, who have been cited as witnesses by Professor Scott, are contemporaries respectively of Plutarch and Galen, but birds of a different feather. Plutarch and Galen, like all the writers just quoted from Strabo to Hippolytus, continue the Hellenistic tradition. Both Dio and Lucian are Atticists, and as such, not disposed to think highly of Hellenistic idioms and idiosyncrasies. Furthermore, neither of them would have acceded without qualification to the proposition that Homer was the best poet. One would not, therefore, expect them to welcome this naïve turn of speech with open arms, and they do not. But their attitude is not the same. Dio deliberately flouts it; Lucian does not do that, either in the passages to which Professor Scott refers or, as far as I am aware, anywhere else in his works, but contents himself to damn it with faint praise.

Dio has, of course, no inclination to exclude Homer from the Republic, and it would have been fatal to any Imperial lecturer to denounce him too severely, or even to refuse to praise him warmly on occasion. But he is no longer "the wisest," except to borderers like the Cilicians (80. 7, 'Ομήρου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς σοφωτάτου) and the

Borysthenites (36 init.). "We have changed all that." Phocylides is just as good (36. 10), Hesiod, indeed, "both wiser and better" (12. 23)—a flat contradiction of Plato! Moreover, he takes frequent occasion to make it clear that Homer is not the only poet; there are others. After citing Homer, he brings in as "another poet" Pindar (12. 81) and Euripides (13. 5; 23. 2); and the thrust is even keener when, after Hesiod, Homer himself is introduced, not as "the Poet" but as "another poet" (78, 16).

From Dio's point of view, then, it is not strange that he sometimes ascribes quotations to "the poet" which do not come from Homer. In so doing, we must suppose that he was consciously recurring to the Platonic precedent of indefiniteness. But to have gone too far in this direction would have been to invite misunderstanding among his hearers, who might even think that he was making a terrible slip, and might correct him then and there. So he does it very seldom, and, I think, with caution. I find no instance in which Hesiod was introduced to them as "the poet," and none outside Homer in which a hexameter is thus labeled. The most daring example runs (1. 8): "as the poet says,

E'en to Asclepius' kin, God never gave such a boon."

But the line, which comes from Theognis (432), is a pentameter, and had become proverbial. So one feels, that Dio's hearer, seeing what he was up to, would merely smile and say to himself or his neighbor: "He's refusing to Homer his guerdon!" In another place (4. 82) the phrase *κατὰ τὸν ποιητὴν* introduces the opening lines of the Orestes of Euripides, iambic, of course, and so well known in Lucian's day that he could parody them without reference to their source. Moreover, it is perhaps worth noting that the citation is so long that any hearer who might have felt moved to speak out in meeting would think better of it before the end. And in the only at all valid instance brought up by Professor Scott (78. 44,¹ Dio, beginning with a parenthetical "they say," outlines a story taken from some lost tragedy to the effect that Heracles on the pyre besought his sons to ignite it, and when they refused reviled them as effeminate, unworthy of him, and more like their mother. Then, with the prefix "saying, as the

¹ In 36. 20 δ *ποιητὴς* carries back to Phocylides, mentioned in 13 and 15; in 74. 2, it carried back to Epicharmus, previously alluded to as *ὁ τοῦτο γράψας τὸ ἔπος*: *νῦν φε κτλ.*

poet puts it," the actual words of Heracles in the play are brought in—a repetition in lyric meters of what Dio has already told us in his own words. Thus ὁ ποιητής would be more or less equivalent to ὁ ταῦτα ποιήσας in the minds of the audience. On the whole, therefore, Dio seems to have been quite as cautious in the matter of violating the established practice as it was possible for him to be if he were to violate it at all.

From his point of view, more remarkable than his use of the phrase in connection with others is the fact that he applies it to Homer, and that too in such a way as to seem distinctly personal. But it must be remarked that twice out of the three times that he does so, he puts the idiom into the mouth of another. Thus in 2. 59, after a parenthetical allusion to the "Spartan embateria" and quotation in full of ἀγέρ' ὦ Σπάρτας εὐάνδρου (Tyrtaeus), we come upon: "military science, which the Poet says Meriones was well versed in; for he has represented one of the Trojans as saying," etc. The speaker here is Alexander of Macedon, who in this dialogue is upholding Homer's cause against the criticisms of Philip. In 21. 16 "himself"—if I may so designate the holder of the leading rôle in the dialogue—refers to Achilles and Hector, whereupon the interlocutor brings in "the Poet," and "himself" condescends not only to understand the allusion but to word his reply as if the name had been used. Again, in 74. 25, "watching, as the Poet says Hector watched the Achaeans," Dio makes "himself" responsible, doubtless through inadvertence.

That Dio knew the idiom, then, is quite as clear as that he was opposed to it; and it is also patent that, with the best will in the world, he did not think it expedient to go very far in his attempt to reintroduce the Platonic indefiniteness of the expression.

Lucian is much more conservative than Dio. He does not take the question very much to heart, for he has no great use for any of the poets except as literary salad-dressing. But he knows that Hesiod is considered the best nowadays, admitting it half in jest in *Hesiodus* 1 and asserting it half in earnest in *Calumnia* 8; for the line which he quotes there was attributed to Hesiod by the generality.¹

¹ "Judge not a suit until both sides you hear," alluded to by Cicero as "illud ψευδοσιγώδειον, ita enim putatur" (*ad Att.* 7. 18; cf. Bergk ii. p. 93).

He directly recognizes Homer's standing as the poet par excellence only in the parenthetical phrases *ὡς ὁ ποιητὴς φησι* (*Calumnia* 24) and *κατὰ τὸν ποιητὴν* *Eunuchus* 3, *Saltatio* 79, and *Prometheus* 4, where it comes upon the heels of a citation from Hesiod.¹ Indirectly, however, he acknowledges Homer's right to the title by taking care not to give it to anyone else. At least, if there are any cases, I have not observed them.² To Lucian, Pindar is "the Theban poet" (*Imag.* 8) and "the poet that praised Orion's dog" (*pro. Imag.* 19); Stesichorus is "the Himeraean poet" (*pro Imag.* 15); Anacreon "the Tean poet" (*Herc.* 8); Simonides "a famous poet" (*pro Imag.* 19); Bacchylides simply "the Cean" (*Scytha* 11); but not one of the immortal choir is "the Poet." Even the formulaic phrases can be used of the others only with a difference. Sometimes they are varied into vagueness by substituting *ὁ ποιητικὸς λόγος* for *ὁ ποιητὴς*; so *Prom.* 13, *κατὰ τὸν ποιητικὸν λόγον*, "γαῖαν ὕδει φύρας." (Hesiod), and *Conviv.* 3, "μῶς" γάρ, φησὶ καὶ ὁ ποιητικὸς λόγος, "μνάμονα συμπόταν" (melic). These cases seem to me very significant. The closest thing to an actual exception that I have noted is in *Scytha* 9: *κατὰ τὸν ποιητὴν ἐκείνον*, "ἀνθεῖσαν ἀγαθοῖς πᾶσιν οἷς θάλλει πόλις." This quotation, perhaps from Archilochus (Bergk iii, *adesp.* 18) comes immediately after an allusion to the *Odyssey*. All that saves the day is the pronoun, but that is quite enough, for it is used in exactly the same way in *Rhet. Praec.* 8, where *τὸν ποιητὴν ἐκείνον* does not refer back to Hesiod, mentioned in the previous section, but cuts off to Epicharmus, as the wording of the allusion shows.³ The psychological effect of the pronoun upon the hearer is to hold him up—to prevent him from passing judgment upon the source of the quotation until he has heard it.

¹ In *Prometheus* 4, the Ms B and its congeners read *κατὰ τὸν Ὅμηρον*, which was introduced into the text by Jacobitz and has been retained in all editions prior to the Loeb.

² The case brought up by Professor Scott is not in point, nor is the person there referred to "a certain writer of dramatic poetry." Summarized, the passage runs: "You want me to repeat the philosophical discourse that I heard from Nigrinus. But good plays are often spoiled by bad acting, and I should hate to have this play come to grief through fault of mine. So if I fail to put it across, remember that the poet is not responsible" (*Nigrinus* 9).

³ It may be that Lucian expected his hearers to remember their Xenophon, who quotes both passages together (*Mem.* 2. 1. 20). The pronoun is similarly used in *Alcib.* ii. 142 E; after Homer, an unknown is introduced as *ἐκείνος ὁ ποιητὴς*.

As to the practice of the other Atticists, I can speak only with reserve, but they seem to me in general to take up a position slightly different from that of Dio, or even of Lucian—to refrain entirely from attributing quotations to an unspecified “poet,” and to refer to all poets, Homer included, by name. They return, in other words, to the practice of the Attic orators and historians. The only exception that I have found among them is indeed a notable one, no other than Phrynichus, who quotes Homer twice by name and twice as “the Poet,” quite in the good old way.¹ But after all, Phrynichus was but a Hellenistic grammarian at heart, a typical *κεϊτούκειτος*, in whom it is no matter for surprise that he followed in this respect the Hellenistic tradition. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Aelius Aristides, Appian and Arrian, Aelian, the younger Philostratus—all these, in so far as my observation extends, quote by name only. And even outside strict Atticist circles, the protest of the Atticists did not go unheeded. Pausanias seems to quote Homer only by name, and so, except for a single inadvertence, does Hermogenes the rhetorician.² Moreover, most of those who employ the idiom after Dio’s time do not exhibit the same whole-souled enthusiasm for it as Polybius and Strabo; they at least avoid monotony. Plutarch and Galen, for instance, employ it pointedly, indeed, but seldom. Few, I imagine, use it as often in proportion to the number of their quotations as do Phrynichus and S. Hippolytus. Aristides Quintilianus is one of the few, but his struggle to attain variety is obvious and amusing; he cites first “the Poet” (ii. 80), then “Homer” (87), then “the Poet” (105), then “Hesiod” (iii. 142), then “the Poet” (158), then “Homer” (160), then (161) “an ancient oracle that issued from the tripods at Delphi,” and immediately thereafter (and almost inextricably involved in his discussion of the oracle), once more “the Poet”!

No doubt about it, the Atticists scotched this mid-Victorian turn of speech; but they could not kill it. Without attempting to follow it down through the centuries, we may note that in the fifth Proclus not only employs it again and again in his philosophical writings but

¹ As “the Poet,” 45 and 120; as “Homer,” 325 and 345.

² *ὡς ὁ Θουκυδίδης “Σαῦλα μὲν νῆες” καὶ “ἀντίκα βοή ηἴν,” καὶ παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ “Πρόθοος θεὸς ἡγεμόνευε”* (Rabe, p. 304, 7–9).

comments upon it directly in the *Chrestomathy*,¹ and that it is noticed once more in the twelfth century by Eustathius in the preface to his commentary on Homer.

With that we may rest our case, as far as concerns the main issue. But a secondary question which Professor Scott has raised demands attention also. To what extent are we justified in alleging this idiom as proof that a given writer means to ascribe to Homer this or that line, tagged "the Poet," which does not occur in our texts of the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*? That depends, I should say, upon many considerations, but most of all upon the writer in question—his date, his literary affiliations, and his custom, if ascertainable, in this particular. No doubt there are cases in which caution is advisable, but there is at least one where, like Professor Fitch,² I can see no ground for hesitation. I refer to Antigonos, the paradoxographer.

Just who this Antigonos was, we need not stop to consider. But he came from Carystus, not Athens, and wrote his book about 240 B.C.³ Not only his provenience and his date, but the character of his work—a book of marvels—classes him with Timaeus, Polybius, and the unknown compiler of the Aristotelian wonder-book. Antimachus habitually names the authors of his excerpts, even repeating, in the long extract from Callimachus with which his treatise closes, the names of the authors cited by Callimachus. Most of the citations, as one might expect, are from prose, but there are some from poetry; for instance, Philetas, Aleman, Archelaus (twice each), Callimachus, Aeschylus, Philoxenus. Once Hesiod is quoted without any reference to the source, very likely because it would have been superfluous, for it is the famous line about "Boneless," the polyp, chewing his foot in winter. The name of Homer is not mentioned in the work. Three times, and three times only, "the Poet" is introduced. In order to make it quite clear who is meant in each case, it seems advisable to translate all three sections in full. Incidentally, they give an interesting glimpse of Homeric studies in the third century before Christ.

¹ *Comm. in Rem publ.*, Kroll, i. p. 58, l. 14; 87. 17; 93. 14; 112. 2; 147. 16 and 30. *Chrestomathy* ap. Photium, *Bibl. cod.* 239.

² See the *Classical Journal*, XVII (1921), p. 94.

³ Wilamowitz, *Antigonos von Karystos*, p. 32.

7. The fact about sheep-gut is also peculiar; that from rams is unmusical, while that from ewes is musical. That is why the Poet, being everywhere inquiring and curious, may be presumed to have said: "He stretched him seven guts of female sheep" (*Hymn to Mercury*, 51).¹

24. It is admitted on all hands that the Poet is abundantly careful and inquiring.² For instance, Odysseus, when the dogs rushed at him during his ascent to the swineherd's, "sat down in his cunning and let the staff fall from his hands" (*Odyssey* 14. 31). They say, you know, that when a man sits down on being attacked, the dogs do not harm him.

25. There is matter for marvel, too, in the creatures that make themselves look like their background, such as the polyp. He makes himself impossible to distinguish in color from the ground and from whatever he clings to, so that catching the polyp is a difficult business. That, of course, is why the Poet wrote his oft-quoted:³ "My son, have the disposition of a polyp in your breast and adapt yourself."

Even if section 25 stood alone, the use of the times would make it certain enough that he meant to refer the lines on the polyp to Homer. But since it follows (and what is more, in the case of the second instance, directly follows) two unmistakably definite personal allusions to Homer made in the same way, it is as certain as if he had used the name. We may, it seems to me, quite safely say that Antigonus attributes to the Poet, meaning thereby Homer, the *Odyssey*, the *Hymn to Mercury*, and a pair of lines from an old epic, now lost, which dealt with the story of Amphiarus and Amphilocheus.

YALE UNIVERSITY

¹ ὅθεν καὶ τὸν ποιητὴν ὑπολάβοι τις εἰρηκέναι, πολυπράγμονα πανταχοῦ καὶ περιττὸν ὄντα, κτλ. Our manuscripts of the Hymn read συμφώνους. Allen and Sikes, in the preface to their edition (p. xlv), characterize as preposterous the notion of Franke, Baumeister, and Gemoll that Antigonus is here proposing a conjectural emendation, and translate "and one may suppose this was the reason why Homer said." The reading certainly cannot originate with Antigonus—in so far they are right. But since they say expressly that it is old, and must think συμφώνους old too, else they would not adopt it, there were on their own admission two readings current in the time of Antigonus. Taking the view of the German editors as to the meaning of the Greek, I hold that he is expressing his preference, or that of his source, for θηλυτέρων.

² ἰκανῶς δὲ καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς λέγεται παρὰ πάντων ἐπιμελὴς καὶ πολυπράγμων εἶναι.

³ ὅθεν δὴ καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ θρυλούμενον ἔγραψεν.

NOTES ON THE MULTIPLICATION OF CITIES IN ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY

ALLEN B. WEST

My purpose in this paper is to show, by means of a few examples, how the fragmentary nature of our sources has led modern students of ancient Greek geography to make difficulties for themselves by creating out of one city several imaginary cities of the same name or region. I shall make quotations, with running commentary, from a few paragraphs of Pliny's *Natural History* to prove also that this multiplication of cities is not confined to modern writers, and that in Pliny's case it was due to a similar but not identical cause, the fragmentary and unsystematic nature of the extracts and notes he had made from Greek authors. For the central theme of this discussion I have chosen the triplex Apollonia¹ of the Chalcidic peninsula; but other towns, located indefinitely *πρὸς τῇ Θράκῃ*, will engage our attention.

Arnae comes first in point of time, for it issued coins during the early years of the Peloponnesian War.² Since it was not tributary to Athens at any time, especially in the few years before the war, when the Athenians were adding so many names to their tribute lists and were leaving no stone unturned to bring in every possible drachma, its existence at that time must be doubtful. Other towns and villages whose very names would long since have been forgotten are found on the quota records of this period. The issue of coins alone shows that Arnae was more important than these forgotten villages.

Before making the attempt to trace its history, we must ascertain its location. Thucydides in the one passage where it is mentioned, calls it Chalcidic,³ *τῆς Χαλκιδικῆς*. That in itself means little, for

¹ See Pauly-Wissowa, *Apollonia*, Nos. 3, 4, 6. Note, however, that the *Apollonia* of Dem. IX, 26 and Steph. Byz., No. 22 is probably identical with No. 5, of Pauly-Wissowa and not with No. 4. See West, *History of the Chalcidic League*, p. 128, note 26.

² West, *Class. Phil.*, IX, pp. 24-34.

³ Thuc. IV, 103; cf. Pauly-Wissowa, *Arnai*. The coins also show very intimate relations between Arnae and the Chalcidians. West, *Class. Phil.*, *loc. cit.*

the descriptive phrase is capable of two interpretations, in Chalcidice, or the Chalcidian city. But as Arnae was the starting-point of Brasidas' famous expedition against Amphipolis we can probably locate it vaguely to the east of Olynthus. As Thucydides' record runs, Brasidas, after setting out from Arnae, reached Aulon about nightfall where he refreshed his troops in preparation for the night march of about twenty miles to Amphipolis. We may take it for granted that a prudent commander like Brasidas knew how to spare his soldiers on the eve of an important venture like this attack upon Amphipolis, and that marching all day and all night in midwinter would have seemed to him a dangerous and unnecessary waste of energy. He would then make his plans to start from the last point of friendly territory where his preparations could be well carried out. A glance at the map shows that Stagira, which had gone over to him during the preceding summer, was nearer to his goal than any point in what is ordinarily considered Chalcidian territory. He did not start from Stagira, nor could Arnae have been near there, for that region had not been settled by Chalcidians nor was it ever called by Thucydides "Chalcidic." We must look for a place nearer to Aulon than Stagira, which is about fifteen miles away, and also for a place to which the adjective "Chalcidic" properly applies. There is only one place to which we can turn, the Mygdonian land south of Lake Bolbe, which Perdiccas had turned over to Chalcidian settlers at the time when they revolted from Athens at his instigation.¹

No one has left a record of the foundation of a city here in 432, but Greeks turned as naturally to the organization of πόλεις as the modern man to the formation of corporations. Could Brasidas have found a better base for operations against the city on the Strymon than this settlement of Chalcidians in Mygdonia, especially if it was nearer to Amphipolis than Stagira? Let us place it then a little to the south of Bolbe, about ten miles from Bromiscus, where a city called Apollonia was later situated.²

¹ Thuc., I, 58.

² Pauly-Wissowa, *Apollonia* No. 3. The suggestion is here made that Apollonia was founded when Perdiccas made the grant of Mygdonian land to his Chalcidic allies. Except that the first settlement took the name of Arnae, I would agree to this suggestion. As further evidence of Chalcidian settlements in the neighborhood of Lake Bolbe, Arethusa should be mentioned. The name, clearly reminiscent of the

We now see why Arnae was never heard of before. It had been founded only a few years before as the result of a migration, a migration similar to that of the Boeotians who left their homes in Thessalian Aeolis to begin their life anew near Lake Copais. A name occurred to them, Chalcidians as they were, acquainted with the traditions of their ancestral Boeotian neighbors, and they called their town "Arnae" in memory of that earlier migration.¹

But Arnae passes out of our records almost as rapidly as it enters them. We have but this reference in Thucydides, a coin or two, and then silence, except for scattered references to Arne and Kalarnae. The reference to Arne in Stephanus of Byzantium is of the vaguest as to location, τῆς Ἐρασινίων πρὸς τῇ Θράκῃ. The phrase πρὸς τῇ Θράκῃ is indefinite enough to suit our requirements, but the rest of it has been a puzzle to all editors. We can leave the meaning and emendation of τῆς Ἐρασινίων until later, and conclude merely that Arne is a variant of Arnae.²

When we turn to Kalarna,³ which should mean lovely Arna, we are met with a reference to Loukillos and a statement that it was a Macedonian city. The last statement is satisfactory, for Mygdonia was Macedonian before 432 and after Perdikkas. But what can Loukillos, that collector of proverbs, have to say about Kalarna? Was the city so famed for its loveliness that it entered into the

"Euboean Chalcis," is not used by Thucydides (instead he speaks of Aulon and Bromiscus, near which Arethusa was located), but apparently it came into use before the end of the fifth century, for it is commonly associated with the death of Euripides.

¹ Pauly-Wissowa, *Arne*, Thuc. I, 12. The cultural bond between Boeotia and Chalcis was of course very close, and later the political relations between the Chalcidic League and its Boeotian prototype were more than friendly. Other names common to Chalcidice and Boeotia are Scolus and Arethusa, mentioned above. From the genealogical standpoint, Arne was a most appropriate name, for Macedon and Arne were the children of Aeolus. How fitting for the Chalcidians to name their town for the eponymous ancestor of their ally and benefactor. There was already an Aioleion in the Chalcidic peninsula, probably a Bottiaean town. Arne was also the sister of Aleyone and Pliny mentions a Mt. Aleyon in this general region, whether named after Aleyone or Aleyoneus is uncertain. F.H.G., I, 51, 304; IV, 370; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, IV, 36.

² The phrase τῆς Ἐρασινίων has been emended to read Κρεστονίων or Ἐρμυλίων, perhaps Σερμυλίων, but the emendations are not near enough to the original to be satisfactory aside from the fact that the "Arnae" of Thucydides could not be near Sermylia, for that town is too far from Aulon, nor could it be a Crestonian city. See Pauly-Wissowa, *Arne*, No. 4; Bohncke, *Dem. Lyk. Hyp.*, p. 398, *Forsch. a. d. Gebiete d. Att. Redner*, p. 155; West, *Chal. League*, p. 12.

³ Steph. Byz., *Κάλαρνα*; cf. Pauly-Wissowa, *Arnai*.

proverbial sayings of the race, like Croesus or Daton? It would seem so, for its name has apparently been endowed with an extra syllable in the process.

Mela's *turris Calarnaea*¹ undoubtedly refers to the ancient Kalarna and it has been suggested that it can be identified with the "Arnae" of Thucydides. Perhaps at the time Mela wrote, nothing more than a heap of ruins and the decaying walls of some old frontier fortification existed, a landmark to passing travelers. Moreover, our location of Arnae would be in accordance with Mela's statements, vague and unsatisfactory as they are, and also with the views of modern scholars. *Inter Strymona et Athon turris Calarnaea et portus Κάπρον Διμήν, urbs Acanthos*. It is true that from this we should expect to find the *turris Calarnaea* on or near the coast, perhaps in Aulon near Arethusa and Bromiscus, for adjoining it on the south Mela mentions Goat Harbor. But if we should place it here we could not identify it with Arnae. Probably the *turris* was not on the site of the city but on the outskirts of the territory controlled by it, a frontier post.

On the whole it is possible to look for the city of Kalarna inland some miles from Arethusa and south of Lake Bolbe, in the Mygdonian territory which became Chalcidic at the time of the alliance between Perdiccas and the Chalcidians.²

What became of this beautiful Arnae in a land famed for its productiveness? It should have had a long and prosperous existence, and its sudden disappearance from history is more than puzzling. Instead, later centuries saw the Mygdonian Apollonia located in the very district in which we have posited Arnae.³ As no other location for Arnae satisfies all the conditions we have noted, there is only one conclusion to be drawn. Apollonia took over Arnae's heritage. For this some explanation must be sought in the history of the Mygdonian region between the time of Arnae's disappearance from the scene and Apollonia's entry upon the stage.

As we hear nothing of Arnae after 424 and as the remains of her coinage are so scanty, we may start from the working hypothesis

¹ Mela, II, 30; Pauly-Wissowa, *Arnai*.

² Pauly-Wissowa, *Arnai*, agrees in locating Kalarna in the interior.

³ Pauly-Wissowa, *Apollonia*, No. 3.

that the fifth century saw the last of Arnae's independence, an hypothesis which is the more probable because of the political changes which took place in Macedonia at the end of Perdiccas' reign and especially during the rule of his successor. At this time the Chalcidic-Macedonian alliance was dissolved¹ and an efficient centralized government introduced into Macedonia by Archelaus. He was not one to surrender tamely such valuable territory as Mygdonia and to look on unconcerned at the growth of Chalcidian power in a land possessed by his predecessors and claimed by him.² We know that Arethusa was Macedonian at the time of Euripides' death and we may safely assert that Arnae reverted to Macedonia and lost much of its Chalcidian character.

With the end of the Peloponnesian War and the restoration of such cities as Torone and Scione,³ many of whose inhabitants must have found refuge in the Chalcidic hinterland, it is probable that some proportion of Arnae's population returned to their former homes. Another change of considerable importance to Macedonia was the building of roads, and straight ones at that, much to the amazement of Archelaos' contemporaries.⁴ Whether the road later called the "Egnatian way" from Therme to Amphipolis goes back to Archelaos is uncertain, but it would be one of the first to be built for many obvious reasons. Moreover there was some sort of a traveled route south of Lake Bolbe long before Archelaus.⁵

Apollonia was a station on this road. There are two possibilities as to Arnae's relations to Apollonia, one that the two towns are identical, the name alone being changed, and the other, that they occupied slightly different sites. It may be that Arnae was a little off Archelaus' new high-way and therefore disadvantageously located in comparison with the village that was to take its place as the Mygdonian metropolis. Thus when the Chalcidians lost their welcome or their reason for staying in Macedonia and were returning to the homes of their fathers, Arnae would become a deserted village while Apollonia would flourish. The remnant of Arnae's population in time, perhaps in a short time, would look to Apollonia as their political

¹ Thuc., VI, 7.

² Plut., *Lys.*, 14; Xen., *Hell.* II, 2, 9; cf. II, 2, 3.

³ Thuc., II, 99 f.

⁴ Thuc., II, 100.

⁵ Aesch., *Pers.*, 494. It was by this route that the Persians retreated.

center, so far as the Macedonian kings allowed this city to have a political life of its own.

That Apollonia was largely Greek is to be inferred from its struggle against incorporation in the Chalcidic League during the early part of the fourth century. Other Macedonian towns accepted Chalcidic rule, apparently without question. That it had in it a considerable Chalcidic element or at least a pro-Chalcidic party is evident from the speech of Cleigenes at Sparta in 383. This speech is reported by Xenophon, who is our authority for stating that Apollonia was a prosperous and populous city at that time.¹ In fact we are dependent upon the pages of Xenophon for practically all we know of the city in the early fourth century.²

We have now to consider the reason for preferring the name Apollonia to Arnae. I have previously suggested in my *History of the Chalcidic League*³ that Apollonia received its name from the God who promised victory to the Spartans and their allies at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War.⁴ Of course the name Apollonia was common enough among Greek foundations, because of the part played by the "Delphian oracle" in colonization; and it may be unnecessary to assume any connection with the oracular response which offered encouragement to the Peloponnesian allies. But the popularity of Apollo among the Chalcidians and their allies begins in 432 and is proven by their coins. The choice of Apollo coin types by the mints of this region must have been due to a conviction that the God was somehow bound up with their affairs or watching over their interests;⁵ and as it could hardly have been the Delian Apollo, we turn at once to the Delphian god.

Thus it seems only natural to connect the name of Apollonia with the worship of the God through the influence of whose oracle the territory about the town was given to the Chalcidian immigrants; and the assumption is as good whether we consider Apollonia and

¹ Xen., *Hell.* V, 2, 11-20.

² There is some evidence for the belief that Apollonia minted its own coins. Head *Hist. Num.*, I, p. 181.

³ Page 101, note 17.

⁴ Thuc., I, 118.

⁵ West, *Class. Phil.*, IX, pp. 24-34; Head, *Hist. Num.* 2, pp. 203 ff. The Chalcidians, Bottiaeans, Arnae, Acanthus, and Amphipolis adopted Apollo types for their new series of coins after their rebellion from Athens in the fifth century. Orthagoreia, probably Stagira, adopted similar types for its coins in the next century.

Arnae as separate, or whether we think of the city as the Apollonian Arnae, which for some obscure reason dropped the one name for the other. As a parallel we have the Orthagoreian Stagira, a few miles to the southeast, known to history as Stagira, but using the longer name apparently as an official substitute on its coins.¹ It seems best therefore to think of Arnae as the city of Apollo from the start and to assign the change of name to the last years of the fifth century or to the beginning of the fourth and to the shifting of population which marked the reconquest of Macedonia and the re-establishment of the towns destroyed by Athens during the first half of the Peloponnesian War.

During the fourth century Apollonia, in conjunction with Acanthus, appears as a determined enemy of the Chalcidians, petitioning Sparta for aid with a plea that it might continue to enjoy its ancestral institutions.² At least Cleigenes, the Acanthian, in whose mouth Xenophon put these words, implies that the aims of the two cities were identical. But the question presents itself, Could an appeal by Apollonia for ancestral institutions have any other interpretation than that the city wished to return to its Macedonian allegiance? Apollonia had no traditions of independence as did Acanthus, for founded about 432, regained by Archelaus a few years later, and then acquiring its independence at the time when Amyntas was driven from the Macedonian throne, its position as a city-state was new enough to be questionable. It was much better to allow an Acanthian to be the spokesman and to lay the emphasis upon Acanthian history and inherited liberties.

That Apollonia was not independent in the early years of Amyntas' reign is obvious from the treaty which was then made between him and the Chalcidian League, a treaty in which the opponents of the later state are mentioned by name.³ Apollonia was not one of

¹ It may be that the name Orthagoreia applies to Maronea also, as Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, IV, 48, states, or to Maronea alone. But Pliny is hardly a credible witness, and the parallel is as good one way as the other. For another change of name not quite analogous and not definitely proved, consider how the Athenian colony Brea became Amphipolis, if the two are the same, as has been suggested. See Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.*, II, part 1, p. 198, note 3.

² Xen., *Hell.* V, 2, 11-19.

³ Ditt., *Syl.* 135. The suggestion made above was taken from Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.*, II, 224, note 5.

them, although on each of their other frontiers the Chalcidians named a city against which they were evidently planning aggressive measures, or were carrying on war. On the Macedonian or Mygdonian frontier all was apparently peaceful, which can only be explained by the fact that Apollonia was then a Macedonian city and therefore no fit subject for Chalcidian aggression in view of the alliance between the two powers.

But when Amyntas fled and the Chalcidians took over the neighboring Macedonian towns, one after another, Apollonia with probable help and encouragement from Acanthus resisted and gained its independence. Its eagerness for independent existence may be attributable to its population being more purely Greek than that of the Macedonian cities, and this assumption fits in well with our earlier hypothesis that the settlement of the city goes back to the famous gift of Perdiccas.

Modern scholars have assumed the existence of two Apollonias, one Mygdonian, the other Chalcidic.¹ But we have seen that the Mygdonian city was originally Chalcidic, and that Arnae, its forerunner, was called "Chalcidic" by Thucydides. We need not then assume the existence of two Apollonias because of references to a Chalcidic city of that name. Furthermore it is hardly likely that two Apollonias would exist side by side with contiguous territory, as would be the case if we locate one at Pollina and the other at Poligyro as Leake and modern geographers have done. Nor does that indefatigable collector of Apollonias, Stephanus of Byzantium, who locates twenty-five of them, know of more than one in the Chalcidic peninsula.²

We need not rest content with probabilities of this nature. A map will show how mutilated the Chalcidic territory would have been without the district assigned to the Chalcidian Apollonia. The descriptions of Xenophon and Demosthenes³ do not apply to an Olynthus whose control of the hinterland extended less than ten

¹ Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.*, II¹, 224, note 5, refuses to accept two Apollonias. For the Chalcidic city, see Pauly-Wissowa, *Apollonia* No. 4.

² Steph. Byz., *Apollonia* No. 22, an Ionian town, mentioned by Demosthenes, is probably a town beyond the Strymon and not either the Chalcidic or Mygdonian cities. See West, *Chal. League*, p. 128, note 26.

³ Xen., *Hell.* V, 2, 11-19; Dem., XIX, 263-66.

miles to the north and whose bitter enemies dominated one and probably two of the passes between Chalcidice and Macedonia. Olynthus could never have become so wealthy and populous with such a limitation of her territory, nor would she have been in a position to intervene in Macedonia with an Apollonia so located on her lines of communication, controlling the upper reaches of the river which rises near Anthemus and flows into the Toronaic Gulf near Olynthus, for this river is the natural route through the mountain gap at the east end of Mount Calaurus. It is inconceivable that the Chalcidians should have been able to acquire and hold any territory around the head of the Toronaic Gulf without first annexing all intervening districts. Considerations of a strategic nature would never have permitted the Olynthians to overlook such a danger to their rear, even if their desire to gain such a valuable piece of territory as Xenophon describes had never been aroused. Chalcidian trade too would have been seriously hampered without the district about Poligyro, particularly trade with Macedonia which meant a great deal to the merchant citizens of Olynthus. Furthermore, it is doubtful whether the district to the north of the Chalcidic capital was large enough to give Apollonia the wealth and population which Xenophon ascribes to her.

It is evident that the acquisitive Chalcidic League, at the time of its alliance with Amyntas, must have seen the need of holding the district assigned by modern scholars to this Apollonia, for their plans were far-reaching, their connections with Macedon intimate, and their need of good communications both for war and commerce great. This particular district was not Macedonian and the alliance would not have stood in the way of Chalcidian aggression. An Apollonia so situated almost certainly would appear in the treaty along with Acanthus and other Chalcidian enemies. Conversely, the treaty may be taken as definite evidence, negative though it is, that the Apollonia which was the bitter rival of Olynthus was not situated in territory so essential to the security of the league. Such a town would have been among the first to be attacked, certainly long before Mende and Acanthus, which were anywhere from ten to twenty miles farther off, much less essential to the league and, less dangerous to it.

The next piece of evidence for the location of the Chalcidic Apollonia in Mygdonia is even more positive.¹ Hegesander tells us of two streams swarming with fish which supplied Apollonia, the Chalcidic city, with a part of its food. Although he calls one of these streams the "Olynthiac," his account shows that both of them flowed into Lake Bolbe. Now it is manifest that no town in strictly Chalcidic territory could have been situated on or near Bolbean tributaries, for the water-shed between the lake and the Toronaic and Singitic Gulfs was to the north of the Chalcidic district and probably the approximate boundary between it and Mygdonia. Poligyro, where Leake located the Chalcidic Apollonia, several miles south and east of this water-shed, would be the same distance from the source of any tributary to Lake Bolbe and would therefore be in no position to obtain its supplies of fish in the convenient manner described by Hegesander.

The Mygdonian Apollonia, "modern Pollina," fits Hegesander's account exactly, for it is situated near two small rivers flowing northward into the lake. Even though our author calls the city fed by the fish of these streams Chalcidic, we must not suppose that he was acquainted with another city of that name in the neighborhood of Bolbe. We have already seen that Arnae was called "Chalcidic" by Thucydides and was situated in Mygdonian territory, if not identical with Apollonia itself.

Modern geographers have stumbled over the name Olynthiac, given to one of these rivers, and have used it as an argument for locating our city near Olynthus and distinguishing it from the Mygdonian town.² The confusion here is due to the fact that the river got its name from a memorial or tomb of Olynthos, the son of Heracles and Bolbe, and not directly from the capital of the Chalcidic state. Just what or where this monument was, of course we do not know, but it might very well have been in the upper reaches of the river near the ancient frontier between Olynthian and Apollonian territory.

But the chief reason for assuming an Apollonia near Olynthus, distinct from the Mygdonian city, is a passage in Xenophon which

¹ Hegesander, F.H.G., IV, 420; cf. Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.*, II, 224, note 5.

² Pauly-Wissowa, *Ammiles*.

has been taken to mean that the two cities were only ninety stadia apart.¹ The Olynthian cavalry in one of their raids came very close to the walls of Apollonia, where they were surprised and routed. They fled for ninety stadia until they reached the *τείχος* of the Olynthians. If this means the wall of the city, Apollonia can not be very far from Olynthus, certainly on no river that flows northward into Bolbe. But the word *τείχος* may mean a fort or a wall guarding the northern frontier in the pass through the mountains to the south of Apollonia, almost exactly ninety stadia from the latter city. Near this pass are the head-waters of one of the streams which flow by Apollonia, perhaps the Olynthiac itself. We might even venture to locate the memorial of Olynthos somewhere near here, for this pass is the natural route for travel between the coast and Lake Bolbe. A fort or wall there, to be used as an advanced base for operations against northern enemies, would be more than probable.

Furthermore for an advance against Amphipolis and the Pangaeian mines, the possession of the Mygdonian land would be just as important as that of Acanthus; and as the Chalcidians were planning just such an advance in 383, we are not surprised that they should have found the opposition of Apollonia particularly galling and taken steps to incorporate the unwilling city within their league.

So far as I know, there is no further evidence for a Chalcidic as distinct from a Mygdonian Apollonia.² Ancient writers may mention one or the other, but they never hint that there were two cities of that name on the Macedonian frontier. We may therefore conclude that the Apollonia of Xenophon is none other than the city on the Egnatian Way, the heir of Arnae and Kalarna.

¹ Xen., *Hell.* V, 3, 2.

² It has been suggested that the Chalcidic Apollonia must have existed because one Apollonia participated in the synoecism of Thessalonice, while the Mygdonian city was in existence for centuries after Cassander's time. This is no evidence, for other towns that shared in this synoecism were not entirely destroyed and survived side by side with the new city, e.g., Chalastra, Aineia, and Therme. Pauly-Wissowa, *Apollonia* No. 4, in the same sentence where Cassander's destruction of the city is mentioned says that the city had previously been laid waste by Philip, as Demosthenes, IX, 26, states. If it were true that this city had been twice destroyed, it would be no argument against considering the Chalcidic and Mygdonian Apollonias one, for if one city can reasonably be expected to have two lives, it can probably have three; and if the Chalcidic Apollonia can have two lives, the Mygdonian city should be allowed the same number. But for the city destroyed by Philip, see note 1, page 1, and note 4 *infra*.

It is true that Pliny presents us with a second Apollonia on the Chalcidic peninsula,¹ but fortunately he has seen fit to locate it on Mount Athos where it cannot possibly come into competition with the Mygdonian city nor be confused with it. No one, moreover would be likely to call it Chalcidic; so from that standpoint it presents no problems for our consideration. Although Pliny knows of only the Actean and Mygdonian Apollonias in the Chalcidic peninsula, he located a third beyond the Strymon near Oesyme.² He is as fond of Apollonias as some other geographers. But I shall not cite Pliny as a credible witness in geographical matters relating to the Macedonian and Thracian coasts. His work is utterly untrustworthy as a source for Chalcidice. No proof of this is necessary to one who has compared his account of this region with a map. Pliny was ignorant of the most elementary geographical facts and I would suggest that he had an equally elementary knowledge of Greek. His errors may be due to other causes as well, failing eyesight,³ and the lack of a systematic filing card index for his innumerable notes. After reading a few passages relating to the Chalcidic peninsula, we can almost see him at work, combining his notes jotted down at odd moments in his carriage or elsewhere, notes probably of the briefest sort and difficult to understand when he came to make use of them; using his mythological knowledge to supplement his faulty geographical information or his illegible notes; following one source verbatim, then turning to another, or interpolating freely when he found several notes that he thought belonged to the same locality. His notes were filled with extracts of a bizarre or unusual nature. He knew where the stables of Diomedes were and all the ancient names for the island of Euboea. In fact he was much interested in place-names and their changes. Astynomus, whom he cites as an authority for the fourth book, wrote a treatise on this very subject.⁴ Other writers, from whose works he drew material for

¹ Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, IV, 37 f.

² *Op. cit.*, IV, 42. This I think is the city destroyed by Philip. That Pliny mentions it is very little proof that it existed when he wrote. See West, *Chal. League*, pp. 132 f.

³ It would be marvelous if Pliny's eyesight had remained unimpaired, since his passion for reading kept him engaged nearly every moment, from the time he got up from his couch before daybreak until he returned to it at night.

⁴ He is quoted directly for Cyprian names. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, V, 129.

his chapters on geography, were interested in proverbial expressions and their origin.¹

A hasty survey of a part of the paragraph which deals with the Chalcidic peninsula will show what I mean. In it we can see how Pliny joined his notes together and how myths like that of the Giants and Heracles prompted in some measure both the choice of places mentioned and their location. He explains in his introduction to the fourth book that the fabulositas of Greece and the claritas litterarum warrant a detailed study of the Greek peninsula. We shall see him giving two names for the same place, but forgetting that they were the same and not being able to tell from his notes whether they were cities or peninsulas. These illustrations of Pliny's methods will serve as an introduction for a discussion of the Actean Apollonia.

After mentioning Chalastra, Thessalonice, and other cities at the head of the Thermaic Gulf, Pliny continues, *Therme² in Thermaico sinu, oppida Dicaea,³ Palinandrea,⁴ Scione, promontorium Canastraum.⁵* Here I think he comes to the end of one of his notes, for

¹ Aristocritus and Aristides. See Pauly-Wissowa, *Aristokreitos*. Cf. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, IV, 70.

² Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, IV, 36 f., ed. Mayhoff. Chalastra and Therme had participated in Cassander's foundation of Thessalonice.

³ Dicaea is a very obscure town, known to us only from this reference and Athenian quota records. The other Dicaea, near Abdera, and much better known, is also mentioned by Pliny, IV, 42. Pliny's interest in the two Dicaeas is due, I think, to his fondness for places with mythological connections. The myths of Heracles were naturally of first importance in Macedonia and on the Thracian coast. Dicaeus was a son of Poseidon and the good brother of Syleus, cf. note 3, page 13, *infra*, to whom Heracles gave the district of Phyllis, the Pangaeian region, where according to some authorities the fight between Syleus and Heracles took place. Pauly-Wissowa, *Herakles*, 953-54.

⁴ Palinandrea is unknown, probably an unintelligent corruption, which may even go back to Pliny's own notes. Because of the more famous Dicaea παρ' Ἀβδηρα and one manuscript reading -ādera, it is tempting to think of this as going with the word before and intended to call Pliny's attention to the necessity of naming Dicaea again, πάλιν, in connection with Abdera, just as he did do in the next paragraph. Or it may be that the reference was originally to the Abderitan Dicaea which Pliny got into his work in the wrong place for some unknown reason, just as he put Olynthus near Abdera and Olophyxus where Olynthus should be. If it were not for Pliny's location of the otherwise unknown Dicaea we would have no reason for locating it on the Thermaic Gulf where we should expect to find Aeneia.

⁵ In Cape Canastraum we see Pliny's interest in the Giants and in the struggle with the Gods which Heracles finally brought to an end. Pauly-Wissowa, *Kanastraion*. The giants were born on Pallene. Sometimes the separate contest with Aleyoneus is located here also, in which connection note that one of the mountains that Pliny

the next one which reads, *oppida Pallene, Phlegra*, is obviously a very brief extract which was incomprehensible to him when he compiled his work. Here we have two names that are equivalents, Phlegra being the ancient or poetic name for the peninsula where the struggles between the Giants and the Gods took place, and of which Cape Canastraeum forms the tip. This is the sort of an extract that Pliny might have got from Hecataeus, and it is a fair supposition that the note which he was copying identified the two something as follows, Pallene-Phlegra, with no indication that Pallene was a peninsula and not a town.¹ The next step was easy, to make of it two towns. The third extract begins, *qua in regione* and names four mountains. Perhaps it was taken from Dicaearchus who wrote a work on the heights of mountains. It may refer either to Pallene or to the mountainous region in the interior of the Chalcidic peninsula.² The fourth passage reads, *oppida Nissos,³ Phryxelon,⁴ Mendae*. Mendae shows that we are on Pallene,⁵ and Pliny continues from another note, *et in Pallenensi Isthmao, quondam Potidaea, nunc Cassandra colonia*. From here Pliny ranges far back into the interior with Anthemus where Heracles killed the pursuing Geryones.⁶

mentions in his third extract is called Alecyon. We may have in some of these extracts which show familiarity with the myths of the Giants traces of Pliny's use of Apollodorus to whom we are indebted for much information about their struggles with the Gods.

¹ Herodotus took much of his geographical information for this region from Hecataeus. For Pallene-Phlegra see VII, 123. In other passages, Pliny's account runs parallel to Herodotus, but as he was not one of Pliny's authorities it is possible that Pliny went back to Hecataeus. For other possible Hecataean extracts see page 13, note 3, and page 10 f.

² Two of these mountains are possibly bound up in Pliny's mind with the Heracles myth, Alecyon, see note 6, page 9, and Epytus, note 4, page 13. Epytus may be nothing more than a blunder for Aphytis, since the spelling of the manuscripts varies, one form being Aephytus. A third mountain, Hypsizonus or Hypsizorus could be what Pliny made out of *ὕψιστον ὄρος*, a descriptive phrase applying perhaps to one of the others named. The fourth mountain Elaeuomene is entirely unknown, as is the location of the other three. This extract probably came from some monograph on Mountains such as that of Dicaearchus. Cf. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, II, 162.

³ Nissos as a city unknown, quite probably a corruption for *Κισσός*, a mountain located possibly near Therme. As Pliny's towns sometimes strayed from their proper location or were originally peninsulas, perhaps Mt. Cissus became a town through the simple straying of the *oppida* of the text from its place after Nissos to a place before it.

⁴ Unknown.

⁵ Mendae should have come before Scione in our first passage. The coins of Mendae show the youthful head of Heracles.

⁶ Apollod. II, 108.

Next he tries to follow along the coast of the Toronaic Gulf, *Olophyxus, sinus Mecyberna, oppida Myscella, Ampelos*,¹ *Torone*,² *Siggos, Stolos, fretum, quo montem Atho Xerxes . . . abscidit*. Olophyxus and Stolos are from their proper locations, but it is perfectly clear that Pliny has confused Olynthus with Olophyxus, for his location of the latter town is exactly that of the Chalcidic capital. Here is a mistake due either to faulty eyesight or illegible notes, in addition to the more fundamental geographical ignorance of the author.

In this short passage of less than ten lines, we can see traces of five or more sources combined or thrown together into a most confusing whole. Within the separate extracts there is an element of accuracy, hardly more, since we find Scione near to Cape Canastraeum, Mende not far from Potidaea, and Pallene and Phlegra mentioned side by side; but no one can think that Pliny knew the geography of Pallene, nor could any reader get a correct impression of the order of cities from his account. Pliny was undoubtedly a voracious reader, but a most indifferent scholar.

So far, as we have seen that Pliny's inaccuracies were due to similarity of names and an unintelligent combining of unintelligible notes. I should now like to enquire as to Pliny's knowledge of the Greek language and as to the way he used mythology to supplement his other deficiencies. We must return to Olynthus, but to an Olynthus, according to Pliny, situated beyond the Strymon river on the Thracian coast. So far as we know there was no such city there. Pliny reads as follows:³ *Mons Pangaeus, Heraclea, Olynthus, Abdera libera civitas*. The Heraclea of this passage is like Olynthus, otherwise unknown; but like the Apollonia of Athos, as we shall see, it is situated in a region that might very well have honored Heracles in this way. Pliny knew of the connection between the Heracles myths and the Thracian coast,⁴ for after mentioning the *stagnum Bistonum* and *gens*, he continues, *oppidum fuit Tirida, Diomedis equorum = stabulis dirum*. Then when he saw a note referring to Heracles and

¹ Ampelos was a cape, not a town; also companion of Dionysus. Pauly-Wissowa, *Ampelos*.

² For Torone's relations with the Heracles myths, see page 13.

³ Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, IV, 42.

⁴ For Heracles and Mt. Pangaeus see note 4, page 9.

his son Olynthus, perhaps copied hastily from Hecataeus,¹ ἀπὸ 'Ολύνθου τοῦ 'Ηρακλέους, he undoubtedly confused Olynthus the son with Olynthus the city, then read 'Ηρακλέους as 'Ηρακλείας and placed the two towns side by side a little to the west of Abdera, a town founded by Heracles himself as a memorial to his beloved Abderus whom the man-eating horses of Diomedes had devoured.² We have already seen how the myth of the birth of Olynthus has brought about a duplication of Apollonias. It now produces an extra Hera-clea and a second Olynthus.

With these illustrations of the workings of Pliny's mind, let us return to the Actean Apollonia. Lacking all evidence for this Apollonia except Pliny's own word,³ I shall try to show why Pliny might have thought there was a city of that name on or near Mount Athos. There could be no more likely spot for a city named after Apollo Actius than on Acte, and Apollo Iatros might very well expect to be honored in a place that was famed for its health-giving climate. Pliny refers to the salubriousness of Acte elsewhere and in our passage says that the inhabitants of Apollonia were nicknamed *Methuse-lahs Macrobii cognominantur*.⁴

But as he would not have invented a town just to give Apollo due honor in a place where he was, or at least ought to have been, worshipped, we must attempt to discover Pliny's source. Unless he took his statement directly from some author who spoke of an Actean Apollonia, which for negative reasons seems improbable, we may assume that he has again entirely misunderstood his notes and combined them in such a way as to make his account as bewildering as usual.

The passage which assigns this unknown Apollonia to Athos reads as follows: *Nunc sunt . . . Cleonae, Apollonia, cuius incolae Macrobii cognominantur*.⁵ There was a town named Cleonae on

¹ See Steph. Byz., "Ολυνθος.

² F. H. G., I, 58.

³ The existence of this Apollonia has not gone unchallenged.

⁴ Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, IV, 37; cf. VII, 27; XXIX, 120; Ael., *Var. His.*, IX, 10; Mela, II, 32.

⁵ Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, IV, 37. Of the three towns omitted above, Palaehorium is unknown, Thyssus is familiar to us from Herodotus and Thucydides, while Uranopolis is mentioned by Strabo. Uranus was the father of the Giants, one of whom was Athos.

Acte and Pliny might have gained that information from numerous sources. But he was sometimes guilty of confusing towns of similar names, as we have seen,¹ and I would suggest that one of the notes he had taken read, *Calarnae: Apollonia*, considering the two towns as one and the same.² But Calarnae looks and sounds something like the known Cleonae; and in his customary hasty way Pliny interpolated the reference to Apollonia, making of it a separate town, and characterizing it with the unusual clause that follows in the text. This clause is probably from the same note that had identified Calarnae with Apollonia. Pliny had reasons enough to locate Apollonia on Athos, its supposed conjunction with Cleonae in his notes, the longevity of the inhabitants of Athos, the good climate, and the special favor with which Apollo would be likely to regard a city named in his honor.

But this little parenthetic expression, *cuius incolae Macrobiani cognominantur*, is unusual enough to warrant further investigation.³ Somewhere Pliny had found a passage which struck his fancy, one that contained a bit of information so striking and unusual that he considered it worthy of preservation for the benefit of his readers. Most cities were to him mere names to be listed, unlike Athens, *nec indigam ullius praekoniam amplius*;⁴ but a place that had changed its name or for any reason could be distinguished from all others which had lived a normal life, such a place was a God-send to Pliny who needed something to give spice and interest to his work. In Pliny's mind the unusual was not insignificant but conferred a special distinction upon cities and places that were for most people unimportant. It is evident that in Pliny's notes Apollonia had attained this distinction, although no other writer whose works we know had seen fit to mention even the existence of such a place.⁵

¹ Olophyxus and Olynthus.

² Compare Pliny's mistake with Pallene and Phlegra. Calarnae and Kalarna are variant spellings for the same name, like Arne and Arnai.

³ As examples of the odds and ends that Pliny saw fit to preserve, note the following quotations which do not pretend to be exhaustive: IV, 42, *Diomedis equorum stabulis dirum*; 43, *Doricum X hominum capax*; 47, *Bizye, a Terei nefasto invisa hirundinibus*; 73, *Myrinam, in cuius forum solstitio Athos eiacularum umbram*.

⁴ IV, 24.

⁵ Fortunately the geography of Athos is fairly well known to us from many sources, dating both before and after Pliny's time. See Pauly-Wissowa, *Athos*.

On the other hand, Calarnae, the forerunner of Apollonia, had just this distinction. It had become proverbial.¹ It may still be possible to discover the spirit or phrasing of the saying about Calarnae, by a study of the meaning of the name. If Calarnae means lovely or beautiful Arnae, "as lovely as Arnae" would naturally be one form of the proverb mentioned by Loukillos. But it is likely that there were variations. At any rate a city so famed must have been particularly blessed by fortune. Are there any other references to the lovely city? There is the puzzling phrase from Stephanus, "Ἀρνη τῆς Ἐρασίων."² I would interpret these words as another reference to the reputation of the city and emend to Ἐρασίων a very simple emendation which would allow us to translate freely as follows: "Arnae, of the land of delights, or of milk and honey." When we follow the Egnatian way through Mydgonia we need not be surprised to find that the next station to Apollonia was Melissurgis.³ Mydgonia was a land of honey.

A third form of the saying might well have compared the inhabitants of Arnae with the blessed ones, *μάκαρες* or have called them *μακαρβιοι*. Such an expression would have delighted Pliny's heart, for it would be so extremely fitting for insertion in his book. He would copy it at once, and as sometimes happens, notes hastily copied and laid aside for later use are difficult to decipher when they are needed. I presume Pliny saw the proverb in some such form as *μακαρβιοι*, and in copying it either misunderstood it and confused *μακαρβιοι* with the *μακροβιοι* inhabitants of Acte, or copied it so illegibly that he thought he had written Macrobian. This misunderstanding of an original Greek note is parallel with Pliny's creation of an Olynthus out of a passage taken possibly from Hecataeus.⁴

¹ See page 3 *supra*.

² For unsatisfactory emendations, see page 2, note 4.

³ Pauly-Wissowa, V, 1991 f.

⁴ Pliny has no rule about translating Greek names into Latin. In the same paragraph he will translate one and leave another untranslated but not untransliterated, and therefore difficult to recognize. For an example of this peculiarity see IV, 46, *portus . . . alter qui Mulierum cognominatur. Promontorium Chryseon Ceras, in quo oppidum Byzantium*. The *Portus Mulierum* is Γυναικῶν Λιμὴν, and *Chryseon Ceras* is the Golden Horn. It is a fair question to ask whether Pliny knew how to translate some of the things he left in their Latinized-Greek form. But note that *Chryseon Keras* in IX, 50, becomes Aurei Cornus.

Pliny probably made up his account of the towns on Athos from two notes something like this. One note read . . . *Thyssos, Cleonae*, the other *Calarnae-Apollonia incolae Macarbioi*. The second note would normally be expanded, *quondam Calarnae, nunc Apollonia*, or *Apollonia prius Calarnae dicta incolae cuius*, etc. The information contained in a note like this would delight Pliny because it made Apollonia doubly distinguished, first for its change of name and secondly for the proverbial saying attributed to it. But when Calarnae in Pliny's blindness became Cleonae, and Apollonia following the metamorphosed Calarnae-Cleonae slipped into a list of Actean cities, his attention was absorbed by the unusual nature of the second half of his note, and he forgot all about the change of name from Calarnae to Apollonia which he had originally intended to mention. It was then easy for the blessedness of the Mygdonian city, separated so far from its natural habitat, to become the longevity of the newly created Actean city.

This analysis of the notes on which Pliny based his list of cities on Athos is the more probable because Apollonia comes at the end where an additional name would naturally be interpolated. Furthermore some explanation is necessary for Pliny's confining the far-famed longevity of this district to the narrow limits of one city, when the whole peninsula was known to be particularly salubrious. If Pliny had written *quorum incolae* instead of *cuius incolae* no discussion would have been necessary, but since he singles out for distinction a city not only not distinguished for this or for any other reason but even unknown, we have had to go farther afield for an explanation.

Of course Pliny knew of the Mygdonian town, for he says,¹ *Stagira Sithone, Heraclea et regio Mygdoniae subiacens, in qua recedentes a mari Apollonia, Arethusa*. This is accurate enough except that here we have another unknown Heraclea² and that Sithone, instead of being a town, was probably the peninsula on which Torone was

¹ Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, IV, 38.

² Heraclea is another example of Pliny's confusion of geography with mythology, and it would not be surprising if it went back to another note from Hecataeus describing the location of another of Heracles' exploits, the killing of Syleus in the so-called *Συλῆος πεδίων* of Herodotus, VII, 115; cf. Pauly-Wissowa, *Herakles*, 953 f.

located, and therefore it has no business being in the neighborhood of Mygdonia and Stagira. Mythologically, however, it is correct to bring together the names of Torone and Heracles, for Torone is said to have been the wife of Proteus, whose sons Polygonus and Telegonus Heracles killed.¹

In conclusion Arnae, Arne, Kalarna or Kalarnae, and the three Apollonias are one. As for Pliny, we are justified in calling him a blind and indefatigable collector of unintelligible notes, which he has strung together in an extremely hit-or-miss fashion.

WHEATON COLLEGE,
NORTON, MASS.

¹ Pauly-Wissowa, *Herakles*, 955. It was on Mt. Epytus, mentioned by Pliny earlier in the chapter, that Proteus prayed the Gods to be taken back to Egypt.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

TWO IMPRESSIONS OF AN ALDINE PLINY

In Pliny's *Letters* iii. 1. 8 the correct reading is doubtless *eadem facere*. All the MSS, including the recently published Morgan fragment, read so. Keil reported in his edition of 1870 that Aldus read *agere* for *facere*. I collated for my critical edition (Leipzig: Teubner, 1922) the copy of Aldus in my own possession, and reported the same, *agere*. But Professor Rand protested that Aldus read *facere* here in his first edition (1508) and *agere* only in his second (1518). This led to a re-examination of accessible copies. Professor Rand verified the reading of the Harvard copies as *facere* (1508) and *agere* (1518). I found my copies to read as I had reported, *agere* in both editions. But the two copies of the Aldus edition of 1508 in the Classical Library of the University of Chicago both read *facere*, like the Harvard copy, while the Chicago copy of the 1518 edition reads *agere*, like the Harvard copy and my own. There is no sign of correction in this place in any one of these copies. It will be noted that the two variant readings are of about the same length, and stand at the end of the line in the Aldus-text; the change required no rearrangement of type in the line. The words are also perfect synonyms here. We evidently have to do with what was to me (and to the expert Mr. Voynich, whom I have consulted) an unexpected phenomenon in an issue of Aldus, two printings of the same edition with the same colophon, and no manifest way to determine which was the earlier. How many more variations may be found in that same first edition it is of course idle to conjecture. As soon as I can find time I must collate the *agere*-text with the *facere*-text throughout the ten books to determine that interesting point. But if we have two printings, who can tell whether there were not perhaps three, or four, or half a dozen? Did the print read *agere* at first by a slip of the pen or mind of the copyist for the press? But it seems more likely that the book would be set up from some one of the recent printed editions, corrected and supplemented into shape; and all the preceding editions, so far as I have been able to test them, read *facere* in this place. Would a mere typesetter, even in Aldus' learned office, know Latin enough to substitute unconsciously *agere* for the *facere* before his eyes? That is possible, though it appears doubtful. But how did the publication proceed? The edition is said to have been of a thousand copies. Were some of these printed, bound, and sent out to booksellers, before the printing of others was proceeded with, the type being meanwhile held in forms, and subject to such an incidental correction as *facere* for *agere*? Or was the error detected

and corrected in the midst of the printing of the whole edition, though Aldus thought it unnecessary to destroy a lot of printed sheets for the sake of an insignificant error? It seems hardly possible that the change could have been in the other direction, an original (and correct) *facere* being emended to *agere*. In the second edition, ten years later, some of the errors of the first were corrected. But all the copies of the second edition thus far reported read *agere* and not *facere*. How did this happen? By mere carelessness in not entering in the book of the first printing that was to be used as copy for the second edition that error for the correction of which the press had perhaps been stopped? These are some of the puzzling questions that suggest themselves, and must remain unanswered, at least for the present.

ELMER TRUEDELL MERRILL

PETRONIANA

1. Den pleonastischen Gebrauch von *inquit* nach einem die Rede einleitenden verbum finitum hat zuerst Bonnet *Le Latin du Grégoire de Tours* 715.5 konstatiert und mit einigen Beispielen aus Gregorius (z. B. *hist. Franc.*, x, 31 *dicit* aedis aedituus "est hic" *inquit* "lapis opertorio tectus") gestützt. Nach ihm hat Löfstedt seine Aufmerksamkeit dieser Erscheinung gewidmet (*Philol. Komm. zur Peregr. Aethiopiae*, 229-30) und mit scharfem Blicke entdeckt, dass wir es in solchen Fällen nicht mit einem gewöhnlichen Pleonasmus, sondern mit einer Bedeutungsentkräftung von *inquit* zu tun haben. Er behauptet mit vollem Rechte, dass das *inquit* "wahrscheinlich sozusagen mechanisiert und mehr wie ein Zeichen der Zitierung als wie ein eigentliches verbum empfunden" wurde. Er führt derartige Pleonasmen aus dem *adv. aleat.* 3 (dominus in evangelio ad Petrum *dixit* "Petre" *inquit* "amas me"), aus den *Thomasakten* und aus der *Epitome rer. gest. Alex.*, 80-81 an, behauptet aber, dass diese Entwicklung sich schwerlich weit rückwärts verfolgen liesse, "da *inquit* z. B. zur Zeit des Petron noch nicht bedroht scheint." Indessen lehrt uns Petrons Text eines anderen: 9.8, Ascyrtos . . . longe maiore nisu *clamavit* "non taces" *inquit* "gladiator obscoene"; 26.8, unus servus Agamemnonis *interpellavit* trepidantes "et quid? vos" *inquit* "nescitis"; 41.8, Trimalchio rursus *adiecit* "non negabit me" *inquit* "habere Liberum patrem"; 101.9, *negavit* hoc Eumolpus fieri posse "quia magna" *inquit* "navigia portubus se curvatis insinuant." Endlich sei hier noch auf 68.6 verwiesen; lassus tamen cum aliquando desisset (dedisset *H*) *adiecit* Habinnas "et numquam" *inquit* "didicit" wo Buecheler die beiden Worte *numquam inquit* aus dem nunqd des Traguriensis gewonnen hat, glücklich, wie es mir scheint, denn seine Verbesserung trifft ausgezeichnet den eben behandelten pleonastischen Gebrauch von *inquit*. Übrigens haben wir ein Beispiel für diesen Gebrauch auch bei Kommodian *instr.* I 2.1-2 in lege praecepit dominus . . . "nolite" *inquit* "adorare deos inanes,"

und aus den alten Zeiten bereits bei Livius vii 16.5 exclamat "aspice imperator" *inquit* "quemadmodum exercitus tuus tibi promissa praestet" und gerade diese Stelle ist ein beredtes Zeugnis dafür, dass die Entwertung des *inquit* bereits im klassischen Latein im Begriffe war. In die Sprache des Livius kann dieser Gebrauch aus der Volkssprache seiner Heimat eingedrungen sein, könnte daher als ein Zeichen der ihm so oft vorgeworfenen "patavinitas" betrachtet werden.

2. Als eine wahrscheinlich volkstümliche Redewendung bezeichnet Otto *Sprichw.*, 166, die Ausdrücke Petrons, wie 38-5, phantasia, non homo; 43.3, discordia, non homo; 44.6 piper, non homo. Ähnliche Ausdrücke wie 58.13, mufrius, non magister; 74.13, codex, non mulier; 134.9, lorum in aqua, non inguina (welche Legebade *Observ. gramm. et crit. in Petr.* 5 sämtlich berücksichtigt) gehören bloss der formelhaften Bildung wegen hierher. Ich beschränke mich jedoch diesmal auf die Ausdrücke mit "non homo" und führe als schlagende Parallele Amm. Marcell. xvii 11.1 an, wo ein stark behaarter Mann "capella, non homo" genannt wird. Der volkstümliche Ausdruck scheint sich auch im griechischen eingebürgert zu haben, wie Lukian *dial. meretr.* 312 λίθος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος zeigt.

3. Es wurde schon des öfteren darauf hingewiesen (F. Haase *miscell. philol.* 3, Breslau, 1861; Gottschlich: *De parodiis Senecae apud Petronium* Breslau, 1863. 26; L. Friedländer: *Petronii Cena* 275 und E. Thomas: *Petrone* 58.1), dass sich Petron manchmal parodistische Anspielungen auf Seneca erlaubt (z. B. Petr. 47.6—Sen. *tranqu. an.* I 16: sibi verum dicere). Ich möchte hier die Kenntnis dieser Beziehungen um eins vermehren. Trimalchio, als das Zechen schon ziemlich vorgeschritten ist (70.10), erlaubt seinen Sklaven bei dem Tische Platz zu nehmen. Die Folgen dieser Grossmütigkeit sind, dass die ganze Dienerschaft, mit dem nach allerhand Düften riechenden Koch an der Spitze, schnurstracks die Ruhebetten anstürmt und die Gäste beinahe von ihren Plätzen verdrängt. Trimalchio begründet natürlich auch theoretisch seine Verfügung; et servi homines sunt et aequae unum lactem biberunt, etiam si illos malus fatus oppresserit. Man vergleiche damit die Ausführungen Senecas ep. 47: servi sunt immo homines . . . immo contubernales . . . immo humiles amici . . . immo conservi si cogitaveris tantundem in utrosque licere fortunae, itaque rideo eos qui turpe existimant cum servo suo cenare. Dann schildert er das unglückliche Los der Sklaven, um wieder fortzufahren: cum his cenare non sustinet et maiestatis suae deminutionem putat ad eandem mensam cum servo suo accedere. Wenn man den ganzen Charakter des Seneca-Briefes richtig ins Auge fasst, wenn man sich ferner die burleske Anwendung des ernsthaften stoischen Grundsatzes bei Petron vergegenwärtigt, ist man m. E. gezwungen anzunehmen, dass an der angeführten Stelle Petrons eine direkte Parodie auf den genannten Seneca-Brief vorliegt.

4. Es ist bekannt, dass Petron einen breiten Gebrauch von der Parodie des epischen Stils macht. Ich halte es für überflüssig hier die diesbezüglichen

Stellen anzuführen, zumal sie bereits mehrfach (zuletzt von M. Rosenblüth: *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde von Petrons Satiren* 21.44.74 und von mir in meinem, im Erscheinen begriffenen Buche: *Petron und sein Zeitalter*) erörtert worden sind. Doch möchte ich hier ein interessantes Beispiel der Stilparodie anführen, weil es nicht im allgemeinen den epischen Stil parodiert, sondern sich an ein bestimmtes Vorbild hält, was bei derartigen Parodien ein äusserst seltener Fall ist. (Anführung einiger Epos-Zeilen in komischer Absicht gehört nicht in diese Klasse der Parodien.) Ich meine das Gebet des Encolpios an Priapus 133.3. Das poetische Gebet betont unter anderem V. 6 ff. *non sanguine tristi perfusus venio, non templis impius hostis admovi dextram. . . .* Ich verweise auf Verg. *Aen.* I, 527–29: *non nos aut ferro Libycos populare penates venimus aut raptas ad litora vertere praedas, non ea vis animo nec tanta superbia victis.* Die Übereinstimmung in der Fassung ist so auffallend, dass man nicht umhin kann die absichtliche Anlehnung Petrons an die angeführte Vergilstellen anzunehmen, zumal es auch feststeht, welch grosses Interesse Petron dem Vergil im *Satiricon* entgegenbringt.

MÁTYÁSFÖLD, HUNGARY

J. RÉVAY

ON CICERO, *AD FAM.* vii. 10. 2

In this passage we read: "Quamobrem camino luculento utendum censeo; (idem Mucio et Manilio placebat), praesertim qui sagis non abundares." Here Tyrrell, in his *Correspondence of Cicero*, Vol. II, p. 200, has this note: "This was, *counsel's opinion* [the italics are his] of these celebrated jurists, Mucius and Manilius. . . . The only trace of humour is in the appeal to the *responsa prudentium* to conform such a very obvious truth, that if you are cold you ought to keep a good fire." Such a "frigidus et arcessitus iocus" seems worthy of a Claudius (see Suet. *Claud.* xxi. 5) rather than of a Cicero. In fact, the appeal to the *responsa prudentium* is only a part of the quip; the other and better part consists in the choice of *prudentes*, who are selected with reference to their connection with fires. In the case of Mucius the connection is too obvious to call for explanation; for everyone knows how the first Mucius Scaevola earned his surname of "Left-handed." The relation of Manilius to a hot fire is not quite so apparent, but Smith's *Dictionary of Biography and Mythology* tells us that a jurist of that name, consul in 149 B.C., with his colleague Censorinus "burnt the Carthaginian fleet in sight of the city," citing Florus ii. 15 and Livy *Epit.* 49. Florus, in fact, does say in i. 31. 7 (= ii. 15): "Manilio Censorinoque consulibus populus Romanus . . . traditam a volentibus classem sub ipso ore urbis incendit." The *Periocha* of Livy, however, does not mention the burning of the Carthaginian fleet, nor does Appian, who on the contrary says that the Roman siege-works were partly burned by the Carthaginians (*Punica* 98), and that the Roman fleet narrowly escaped destruction. But in either event Manilius is associated with a "hot fire," and apparently he came in contact with a

still more famous conflagration; for Pliny *N.H.* vii. 47 says "Manilius . . . Carthaginem cum exercitu intravit," in which case he probably witnessed the burning of the city.

If the allusion to Manilius should seem too obscure, we may remember that Cicero is writing to a young jurist, who was probably familiar with the literature of his subject and with the life history of the great legal lights of the past. Moreover, the story of Mucius was familiar enough to make up for any possible obscurity attaching to the other member of the alliterative pair. It has been suggested that the jest depends for its fun upon its absolute lack of point. That is a well-recognized form of witticism in modern times, requiring rather a highly developed sense of humor for its appreciation; but I am inclined to think that it was unknown to the ancients. At least, I cannot recall an undoubted and unquestionable example.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

ODYSSEY δ 536-37

οὐδέ τις Ἀτρεΐδew ἐτάρων λίπεθ' οἱ οἱ ἔποντο,
οὐδέ τις Αἰγίσθου, ἀλλ' ἔκταθεν ἐν μεγάροισιν.

οὐδέ τις Αἰγίσθου is undoubtedly corrupt. Commentators have noticed the discrepancy in the story as told here and in λ 412-20, but none of them seems to have fully recognized the lack of all meaning in this passage as it stands. Discrepancy alone would scarcely justify an attempt at emendation, but it is clear that here there is something worse than discrepancy.

1. If all of Aegisthus' followers perished, why is no explanation given of such an astounding catastrophe? Surely, nothing in the story leads the hearer to expect such a marvelous dénouement, and yet we are not told how or why it happened. Only the words οὐδέ τις Αἰγίσθου, as if it were a little matter requiring no elucidation!

2. How, too, can Agamemnon and his followers be said to have been slain like cattle and pigs (cf. λ 413), if Aegisthus' men were killed also in the fray? Do pigs and cattle usually turn on their slaughterers and slay them?

3. Strangest fact of all, how could they all have killed each other *without a sole survivor*, outdoing the feat of the Cadmean Sparti even, and equalling that of the famous Kilkenny cats? And how, if mutual destruction was the rule of the day, did Aegisthus himself escape Agamemnon's θούρις ἀλκή (cf. line 527)?

4. If there were any need to point out further the senselessness of the passage, I would ask, Who were the followers of Aegisthus thus annihilated? Were they the twenty men lying in ambush? But Aegisthus had other retainers with him undoubtedly, if only the house-servants employed in the feast. Who can tell, indeed, to whom the τις Αἰγίσθου refers?

To say simply (as Merry does) that "the story here told is inconsistent with the form of it in *Od.* 11. 405 foll." seems to me a very meager and unsatisfactory comment. The only proper criticism to be made of the line is that it is inconsistent with *sense* itself and therefore corrupt.

I believe that line 537 originally read:

δῶματ' ἐς Αἰγίσθον, ἀλλ' ἔκταθεν ἐν μεγάροισιν.

and that the comma at the end of line 536 should be omitted. The reasons for my conjecture are:

1. The change from *δῶματ' ἐς* to *οὐδέ τις* is a comparatively slight one, and with *οὐδέ τις* immediately above in the preceding line, its substitution is easily explained. We might attribute it to the error of a careless copyist, or consider it the deliberate act of someone who, in a sort of *epanaleptic* fit, thus sacrificed the poet's simple sense for mere rhetorical effect.

2. *οἱ οἱ ἔποντο* requires further modification, seeing that not all of Agamemnon's followers were slain, but only those who followed to the palace of Aegisthus.

3. *δῶματα* in line 528 (cf. *οἰκόνδε* in *λ* 410) sanctions the use of it here. The word was present in the poet's mind.

4. There is no tautology whatever in the occurrence of *δῶματα* and *μεγάροισιν* in the same line. It is true that the words are often used as mere synonyms, as in the next book (*ε* 6 and 14) with reference to Calypso's abode. Here, on the contrary, *δῶματ' ἐς Αἰγίσθον* leads up to and explains *ἐν μεγάροισιν* as the inner part (i.e., *μεγάρον*) of Aegisthus' palace, the banquet hall in which the massacre took place. In the description of Circe's house (*κ* 348-49) the words *δῶμα* and *μεγάροισι* are nearer to each other than even here, and the same distinction in meaning may be perceived.

5. *ἀλλ' ἔκταθεν* would surely require *πάντες* as subject-modifier, if Aegisthus' followers as well as Agamemnon's had all been slain. In the emended line it is not so necessary to emphasize the subject.

6. *οἶκον ἐς* and *δῶματ' ἐς* are found at the beginning of several Homeric lines, but the familiar line in the first book of the *Iliad*, *δῶματ' ἐς αἰγίοχοιο Διὸς μετὰ δαίμονας ἄλλους*, seems especially to support my emendation. The similarity in sound (*δῶματ' ἐς αἰγι-*) is, at any rate, a most striking coincidence!

To conclude, the emendation I offer not only restores sense to an otherwise meaningless passage, but, by removing all inconsistency with the story as given in the eleventh book, greatly aids the advocates of the single authorship of the *Odyssey*, by demolishing one of the chief arguments of their opponents. Is it, indeed, too fanciful to claim that it also adds one proof more to many that the poet of the *Iliad* and the poet of the *Odyssey* was one and the same Homer? A comparison of the emended line with *Il.* A 422 seems to suggest, not mere coincidence nor conscious imitation, but the stroke and expression of one creative mind.

NICHOLAS E. CROSBY

PINE HILL, N. Y.

ILIAD v. 885-87

In answer to Mr. Ivan M. Linforth's criticism of my emendation of this passage, I would say that I agree perfectly with him that the contrast between *among the dead* and *among the living* is hardly more acceptable than that between *dead* and *alive*, if *among* is taken in the sense of "one of" and not "in the midst of." My argument was chiefly based on this distinction of meaning and I clearly showed that *ἐν νεκράδεσσιν* could not signify "among the dead" in the sense of being one of them, though it would have to bear that meaning to justify the use of *ζῶς* in the contrasted clause. What more acceptable alternative, I ask my critic, could there be than: "I would either be suffering agonies there on the ground amidst the horrid corpses, or (in my chariot still) be a mere ghost of myself amidst the living"; that is, "I would be either alive among the dead, or half-dead among the living." This my critic calls hardly more acceptable than the contrast, "I would be dead, or bereft of my power though living," even though there is nothing in the text that bears the slightest suggestion of Ares' death. I rejected the contrast of *dead* and *alive* mainly because the text does not allow it, though my critic gives as my only reason the impossibility of a god dying.

Mr. Linforth's insistence on the "ghost" meaning of *ἀμενηνός* helps rather than weakens my arguments for the emendation, and I should have made a stronger statement of it. To obtain, however, the humorous oxymoron he speaks of, he sacrifices the necessary contrast, for Ares would be both *ἀμενηνός* and *ζῶς* while suffering on the ground amidst the dead.

In conclusion, I cannot comprehend Mr. Linforth's "I *should* (sic) have had a long, hard fight" or how such a strange rendering of the text helps to clarify the meaning by showing any sensible alternative.

NICHOLAS E. CROSBY

PINE HILL, N. Y.

ON ILIAD XXIII. 70

εὔδεις, αὐτὰρ ἐμείο λελασμένος ἔπλεν, Ἀχιλλεῦ;
οὐ μὲν μιν ζῶντος ἀκήδεις, ἀλλὰ θανόντος.

The scholiast takes *ἀκήδεις* as imperfect and the modern editors, Heyne, Ameis, Leaf, Brandreth, Monro, and others, follow him, "understanding" *ἀκηδαίς* with *θανόντος*, and interpret "You did not neglect me living, but you do now neglect me dead." This harsh and improbable ellipse is not only unnecessary but it weakens the pathos of the passage and obliterates a delicate Greek idiom. We should read *ἀκηδαίς*, continuing the present tense of the two preceding verbs *εὔδεις*, and (in effect) *ἔπλεν*. This reading is not easy to translate into idiomatic English, but it presents no difficulties in the Greek: "It is not of me your living friend that you are thus neglectful, but of me dead."—"I whom you neglect am not living but dead."—"It is no

living friend that you thus neglect in me but a dead one." The point is that in the Greek idiom "living" and "dead" are qualities that attach to Patroclus' personality without explicit logical reference to past and present, and that to Greek feeling the fact that he is not living but dead and helpless makes any failure in friendly offices more heinous. πῶς ἐπὶ τοῖς φθιμένοις ἀμελεῖν καλόν, cries the Electra of Sophocles, and Achilles himself had said (I. xxii. 389):

εἰ δὲ θανόντων περ καταληθοντ' εἰν Ἀῖδαο,
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ κείθι φίλον μεμνήσομ' ἔταυρον.

The thought then is not a matter-of-fact contrast between Achilles' actual treatment of Patroclus when living and his present neglect, but the heightened pathos and wrong of neglecting not a living but a dead friend. It is hard to find examples that might not superficially seem to illustrate equally well the other interpretation of the passage. Cf. Pylades' assurance to Orestes (Eurip. *I.T.* 717)

ἐπεὶ σ' ἐγὼ
θανόντα μᾶλλον ἢ βλέπονθ' ἔξω φίλον.

In Aristophanes' *Clouds* 782, Strepsiades comically avers
οὐδεὶς κατ' ἐμοῦ τεθνεώτος εἰσάξει δίκην.

PAUL SHOREY

THE JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

The *Journal of Philology*, founded by Cambridge scholars in 1868, came to an end with its thirty-fifth volume in 1920. An index to the whole series has now been compiled under the auspices of the Cambridge Classical Society and will be issued early in 1923. Subscribers to the *Journal* and others who wish to obtain copies of the Index should apply to the Treasurer, Cambridge Classical Society, University Press, Cambridge. The price of the Index will be 5s. post free.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion. By SIR JAMES GEORGE FRAZER. One volume, abridged edition. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922.

This edition of *The Golden Bough* is a very successful feat of compression. The author has omitted all notes, references, and bibliography, thus saving a large amount of space at one stroke; and the publishers have chosen a fairly small but very clear type which permits them to offer, in the 714 pages which form the text of this volume, matter which would occupy about 1,000 solid pages in the type of the earlier editions. In view of the amount of room taken up by notes in the larger edition, we may estimate that if the present volume had notes and references, and were set up in the larger type, it would fill not less than three volumes of the other style.

The method of abridgment may be illustrated by pages 538-92, which represent Part VI ("The Scapegoat") of the larger edition, a volume of over 400 pages. The greatest saving has been effected by choosing a few good illustrations of any given principle, e.g., the transference of evil, and omitting the mass of cumulative evidence. Sometimes the gist of a whole chapter is condensed into a single paragraph as on page 540 ("Transference to Sticks and Stones") and page 546 ("The Omnipresence of Demons"). Certain chapters, especially such as are in the nature of excursions aside from the main path of the argument, are omitted entirely; for example, the chapter on "The Nailing of Evils," and the discussions of the Saturnalia in Greece and in Western Asia. The classical reader will inevitably regret that these particular omissions deprive him of the author's interpretation of many strange phenomena of Greek and Roman custom, just as he will miss the notes on the Anthesteria and the Lemuria (pp. 153-55 in the larger edition). But the author had to eliminate matter without fear or favor, and on the whole full justice has been done to ancient rites and customs.

Whatever views critics may entertain regarding Sir James Frazer's theories, his work in its present form can be recommended to all students of ancient life and thought, and now with somewhat greater hope that the recommendation will be followed by actual reading. Evidence in support of any opinion must still, of course, be sought in the twelve-volume edition.

The typography is excellent, and the long and valuable Index quite accurate. I have found only one false reference in a large number of trials. A welcome minor improvement is the substitution of the proper form Batak (of Sumatra) for Batta, which was long since rejected by all competent

Indonesian ethnologists. It is to be regretted that Zúñi still appears without the tilde.

It is no part of the purpose of this notice to reconsider the main theses of *The Golden Bough*, which have been discussed by able critics as the earlier editions appeared. Attention may be called to page vi of the Preface, where fresh evidence is cited in support of the author's conclusions about the practice of killing the king; and to the following significant sentence on page vii:

I am so far from regarding the reverence for trees as of supreme importance for the evolution of religion that I consider it to have been altogether subordinate to other factors, and in particular to the fear of the human dead, which, on the whole, I believe to have been probably the most powerful force in the making of primitive religion.

In view of Sir William Ridgeway's well-known position, and the recent utterances of Dr. Farnell, we appear to be confronted with a revival of Euhemerism—which deserves a better name—as noteworthy as that which marked certain chapters of Herbert Spencer's *Principles of Sociology* nearly fifty years ago. Its exponents command respect, and it will have to be taken seriously.

CAMPBELL BONNER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments. By WALTER HEADLAM; edited by A. D. KNOX. Cambridge: The University Press, 1922. Pp. lxiv+466. £3-3.

In the new edition of the *Mimes* of Herodas the world of scholarship is enriched by a singularly thorough and exhaustive piece of work. A glance at the latest edition of the text of Crusius (Teubner) will reveal how much has been done by the present editors toward reconstituting the text of our author: and the commentary is a veritable mine of information on all subjects, resembling in its completeness such works as Munro's *Lucretius*, Ellis's *Catullus*, and Mayor's *Juvenal*.

From few scholars of modern times have Greek studies profited so much as from Walter Headlam. His sudden death in 1908 at a comparatively early age was a great loss to classical scholarship: and the quality of the works published from his notes since his death—the *Agamemnon*, the *Fragments* of Sophocles (in which he had a large share), and the *Mimes* of Herodas—can but serve to increase the sense of our indebtedness to him. The unselfish labors of A. C. Pearson, J. T. Sheppard, and A. D. Knox have preserved to the world works of inestimable value; and it is to be hoped that future years may see yet further memorials of Headlam's rare industry and scholarship.

The principle upon which Headlam worked is enunciated in the Introduction to the *Mimes*, where he says: "There is only one way: learn your

author by heart—every word, and then set to work to read. Many dull authors must be dredged, and for some (the later Attic comedians, for instance, and much Alexandrian poetry) we require to reconstruct.” How faithfully the editors carried out this precept may be seen in the monumental commentary to the *Mimes*.

The following are a few points suggested by a study of the text and notes:

1. 30. *χρηστός*. Nothing is said of the meaning—kind, helpful, generous—which is found also in Theocr. 15. 75, in the Stoics, and in the New Testament.

1. 36. *κοῖνῃ ψυχῇ*. The note is anticipated by Shorey's note in *Classical Philology*, V, 220.

2. 7. *ἢ ἄστυ καὶ χώρα*. This reading is not convincing even with the new context suggested in the page of Addenda.

2. 41. *καίτοι*. An illuminating note on the force of this particle by Paul Shorey may be found in *Classical Journal*, III, No. 1 (November, 1907), p. 27.

2. 65-71. A. E. Housman's interpretation in *Classical Review*, August, 1922, pp. 109 f., should be consulted.

3. 27, note. To the reference from Lucian 2. 598 add Apul. *Metam.* 7. 17,

3. 49. *μηδ' ὀδόντα κινήσαι*. In spite of parallels adduced, the interpretation “to eat” seems most unlikely in this context.

3. 63. *παίζειν* should be written in the text instead of *πέμπειν*; see note.

3. 79. *ταταῖ* is mistranslated in the text; see note.

4. 67. The text reads *ἀνάσιλλος*, but the translation renders *ἀνάσιμος*.

4. 72. *Ἐφεσίου*, note. The name of Apollonius Rhodius is a good example of the tendency in question.

4. 90. *τρώγλην*. Surely this is the hole or den of the serpent, not its mouth.

5. 60. *τούτοις τοῖς δύο*, note. For the omission of *ὀφθαλμοῖς* compare Herodas 6. 23, Theocr. 6. 22.

5. 61. *Ἀχαικάς* as suggesting pain. Possibly Homer *Iliad* 6. 255, *δυσώνυμοι νῆες Ἀχαιῶν*, might be added as an example.

6. 6. *κρίμνα*, note. The reference to Ar. *Nub.* 965, *κεῖ κριμνώδη καταναίφοι*, might be added. For other references to the measuring of food for slaves see Theophr. *Charact.* 26. 23 (Jebb), Theocr. 15. 95, *Juvenal* 14. 126.

6. 17. *ἰορτή*, note. Compare the *Pseudologistae* of Lucian, which explains the application of the term *ἀποφράς* to an enemy.

7. 8-11. The readings suggested by the editor are unconvincing.

But these are mostly trifling points: what is important is the wealth of illustration from all types of Greek literature, with which the notes are illumined. The Introduction, in which the *Mimes* are discussed individually, contains an admirable summary of the main tendencies of Alexandrian literature and of the conditions, social and historical, which led to the development of this particular *genre*. It is full of strikingly happy thoughts and criticisms:

the description of the meter, for instance—"It has a growling and grimacing effect, with an accompaniment of irony, well suited to sardonic humour"—could not be bettered.

The book has properly met with the acclaim which its conspicuous merit deserves. The Cambridge University Press is to be congratulated upon publishing in so short a space such fine works as Headlam's *Agamemnon*, *The Fragments of Sophocles*, Sheppard's *Oedipus Tyrannus*, and the new *Herodas*. Headlam himself, whose voice still speaks to us after fourteen years from the grave, has won that immortality which the Greeks themselves prized most of all:

οὔτοι λείψανα τῶν ἀγαθῶν
ἀνδρῶν ἀφαιρεῖται χρόνος· ἃ δ' ἄρετὰ
καὶ θανούσι λάμπει.

W. D. WOODHEAD

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Martial. Epigrams. With an English translation by WALTER C. KER.

Two volumes. Loeb Classical Library. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1919.

There are but few good English translations of Martial. In prose, indeed, there are very few of any sort and the only ones that deserve mention are the translation in Bohn's *Classical Library* and Alfred West's *Wit and Wisdom from Martial* (Hampstead Priory Press, 1912). The latter, however, contains only 150 epigrams. Verse translations in English are more numerous and have been appearing sporadically since the age of Elizabeth. Among the best is that of William Hay in the middle of the eighteenth century, though many of his versions are far from satisfactory. Mr. Ker makes some interesting remarks (p. xxi) on the "bad eminence" of Elphinston (1721-1809), who in spite of the protests of friends and relatives published a complete metrical translation of Martial. It was on the appearance of this work that Robert Burns addressed Elphinston in the following epigram:

O thou whom Poesy abhors,
Whom Prose has turned out of doors!
Heardst thou that groan? Proceed no further:
"Twas laurell'd Martial roaring 'Murther.'"

Many of the versions of Elphinston and Hay are given by the author of the Bohn translation whose plan was, whenever it was possible, to add to his own rendering a metrical translation by some other hand. Ker fails to mention in his bibliography Paul Nixon's "A Roman Wit," a poetical translation of some of Martial's epigrams.

There is a good reason for the small number of attempts to render Martial into English prose, and that is the great difficulty of the task. This difficulty is present also in the metrical versions but, on account of the

greater freedom allowed in verse translations, is not so keenly felt. The whole point of an epigram often lies in a play on a single word the reproduction of which in English is far from easy. The translation of any author is difficult, but the translation of an epigrammatist is not infrequently a baffling and bewildering problem.

The translation before us is a careful and scholarly piece of work. It is undoubtedly the best of the complete prose translations of Martial. In some passages, however, the interpretation seems open to question. For example, "first-found Nile" in *De spectaculis* iii. 5, is a somewhat misleading translation of *deprensi Nili*. *Deprensi* means merely "discovered." *Prima* is already correctly translated by "at its spring." In i. 3. 1, *Argiletanas tabernas* is rendered by "the shops of the Potters' Field" and in other epigrams (cf. i. 117. 9; ii. 17. 3) we find the same translation, but "Potters' Field" has for us a connotation wholly different from that of the Roman *Argiletum*, which, whatever the origin of the name, was merely the street running into the Forum between the Curia and the Basilica Aemilia. Opinions differ on the interpretation of i. 17 but surely neither the explanation adopted: "It needs a good farmer to make a good thing of a farm and a good advocate—which I am not—to make a fortune by advocacy," nor Friedländer's interpretation cited by Ker that Martial is hinting "that the gift of a farm would suit him better than advice" is as plausible as the old explanation that the life of an advocate would be as distasteful to him as the life of a farmer. The poet is not emphasizing so much his lack of ability to become a pleader as his lack of inclination to lead so laborious a life. It is drudgery of the *colonus* that is stressed, not his skill. But it is in passages like i. 41. 17–20 that the translator is least happy. Here Martial is rallying one Caecilius on his pretentious but wholly unsuccessful efforts to rival the wit of Tettius Caballus. The play is on Caballus which is (1) Tettius' cognomen and (2) a common noun meaning "nag" or, when applied to a person as here, "hack." The point is, of course, quite clear to the translator, but his rendering is sure to leave the reader in the dark, and it is only when he explodes the footnote below that he lets in enough light on the passage to make it in the least intelligible. The joke that needs a footnote has never yet established itself either in original or translated literature. In i. 61. 3, "apprised" may be a typographical error or an orthographical vagary for "appraised." In i. 76. 6, "the name has escaped me" would carry the double meaning of *excidit mihi nomen* better than "the name has dropped from me," and the explanatory note could have been omitted. "May I be shot" in ii. 5. 1 for *ne valeam* tends to the anachronistic. On the other hand "bass" for *lupus* (ii. 37. 4; ii. 40. 4) is probably as justifiable as the current rendering "pike." We have hardly data enough to make out a case for either. The translation of the last two lines of iii. 13, labors heavily with its Miltonic "crude" in the sense of "suffering from indigestion." Even the citation from *Paradise Regained*, IV, 328, "crude or intoxicate," does not justify its

use. In iii. 60. 4, the alternative translation which the translator offers "with lips cut by the shell" seems preferable to the one adopted in his text "through a hole in the shell." Surely the point is missed in iii. 75. 8, where *si verum est* is rendered, "But if there really is anything." The meaning is "if that is true" (i.e. *pulcherrima nuda es*), it is stupid of you to conceal your beauty. In ix. 26. 2, the word "glaucine" means nothing to the English reader, nor does the footnote clear up the point. In ix. 59. 22, "carried them home himself" would reproduce Martial's sneer more closely than "bore them off himself." We "carry" parcels home, we don't "bear" them. Nor can we pass without protest the translation of ix. 71. 8: *celsi lucida signa poli*, "the tall sky's lustrous signs." There is a curious distortion of the original in ix. 74. 3: "On the face of manhood's bloom a father stamped no semblance." Doubtless the translator realizes that all Martial is trying to say is that the father had not had his son's portrait painted since he was a child, but his translation involves an odd reversal of the poet's expression. In ix. 76. 6, the word "besprent" raises the question of the admissibility of obsolete English in the translation of such an author as Martial. In the eighth line of the same epigram the translation must be "the urn told the story of the distant funeral pyre." I can find no satisfactory support for *rogus* meaning "ashes." In the tenth line *major* implies "older" as well as "nobler."

But it is ungracious to accumulate points where the reviewer differs from the translator. Numerous as these may seem, they are very few when compared with that long list of passages where the translator has threaded his way through many difficulties and given us a version that is both correct in interpretation and effective in expression.

GORDON LAING

MCGILL UNIVERSITY
MONTREAL

S. BENEDICTI *Regula Monachorum*, HERAUSGEGEBEN UND PHILOLOGISCH ERKLÄRT, VON BENNO LINDERBAUER, O.S.B. Verlag des Benediktinerstiftes Metten, 1922.

Ever since Ludwig Traube published his memorable study of the *Regula Benedicti* (*Abhandlungen der Königl. Bayer. Akad. der Wiss., philosoph. philolog. und hist. Klasse*, XXI [1898]; second ed. prepared by H. Plenkers, *ibid.*, XXV [1910]) in which he showed that certain later manuscripts rather than the earliest are nearer to the original text of St. Benedict himself, there has been an obvious need of a new critical edition of the *Rule*, based on the principles set forth by Traube. Two different texts were accessible in the Carolingian Period. The one, called by Traube the "normal" text, descended immediately from the autograph manuscript of St. Benedict, of which Charlemagne, with his customary interest in true scholarship, had pro-

cured a copy. The other, or "interpolated" text, represented a revision, probably made by Simplicius, the third Abbot of Monte Cassino, who smoothed away some of the vulgarisms permitted by the pious but unlettered Founder of the Order; at least Gregory the Great calls Benedict unlettered—"scienter nescius et sapienter indoctus." This improved and more generally intelligible form of the *Rule* not unnaturally gained a wider circulation than the original text. Today, of course, it is the latter that scholars are anxious to secure, not only because it represents the *ipsissima verba* of St. Benedict, but because, if found, it would give us a most important monument of the popular Latin of his day.

A compromise edition of the *Rule*—"critico-practica" its author calls it—was published by Dom Cuthbert Butler in 1912. Though he had at first opposed, he now accepts Traube's views in the main, but has refused to admit into his text "*quaedam inculta ac minus Latine dicta*," that is to say, precisely the vulgarisms which interest the student of late Latinity. Within the limits of his plan, which has its justification, Dom Butler has produced, as one would expect, a serviceable and scholarly work. Before its appearance, Dom Germain Morin, one of the most learned of his learned Order, had performed a great service by publishing, in 1900, an exact edition of the *Codex Sangallensis* 914, which Traube showed is nearest of all extant manuscripts to the autograph of St. Benedict. It is a copy made about 820 A.D. for Reginbert, a scholarly and industrious monk of Reichenau, by Tatto and Grimalt, two of the brethren in his monastery. They made their copy directly from the "normal" text prepared for Charlemagne. They had also, at Reginbert's suggestion, supplied in the margin the variants of the revised edition. The St. Gall manuscript is reproduced with scrupulous accuracy by Dom Morin. His work is a veritable fruit-tree laden with plums, which it is strange that no student of vulgar Latin or of the romance languages has gathered in these more than twenty years. A definitely critical edition is expected from Heribert Plenkers, formerly of the Benedictine Order, who has studied the manuscripts for nearly a quarter of a century and has published a preliminary study in Volume I of Traube's *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters* (1906).

Meanwhile, a part of the work ultimately desired has been acceptably performed by Father Linderbauer in the edition before us. He builds altogether on the foundations laid by Traube. His aim is to restore the original text with all its blemishes, shocking though they are to the Ciceronian ear. He accepts the judgment of Traube in virtually all of the twenty-four test passages which the latter discussed, and in general he adheres to the text of the *Sangallensis* and its kindred manuscripts. There are doubtless some cases of error in this group and even in the imperial *Codex* which Grimalt and Tatto copied, so that the other branch of the tradition, as Linderbauer recognizes, must be followed here and there. In the present state of our knowledge, it is well that the editor has refrained from adding an *apparatus*

criticus; for that we must await Plenkers' work. But the full testimony of the manuscripts, so far as it is accessible, is cited in the notes of all important passages where the two versions present different readings, and in general a secure basis has been laid in this edition for a study of St. Benedict's Latinity.

The part of Traube's theory which has commanded least acceptance is his attribution of the interpolated versions of the *Rule* to the Abbot Simplicius. Plenkers, in the work to which I have referred, endeavored to show that the alterations are so diverse in the different manuscripts of the interpolated class, that they cannot be traced back to a single source. He believes that they grew up sporadically in the different European centers to which the *Rule* made its way. In a review of Plenkers' *Gottinische Gelehrte Anzeigen* (1907, pp. 869 ff.), I took up the cudgels for Traube, if not for Simplicius, by showing the insufficiency of Plenkers' test cases and calling attention to the many instances of common interpolations or alterations found in manuscripts of a widely divergent date and locality. This part of my rejoinder is accepted by Father Linderbauer, and if thus much be generally accepted, I do not see why we should not return entirely to Traube's views. If we may speak of a single revision exhibited in early manuscripts written in Italy, England, and France, Germany and Spain what more probable source of its origin than Monte Cassino itself?

But Traube's reasoning is not made up of mere probability. In various interpolated or conflate manuscripts of the *Rule* there is a little poem, crude in rhythm and in style, that speaks of the service of Simplicius in propagating the text of the *Rule*. It runs as follows:

Qui leni iugo Christi	Colla submittere cupis,
regulae sponte de mentem,	dulcis et copias mella,
hic testamenti veteris	novique cuncta doctrina,
hic ordo divinus	hicque castissima vita.
hocque Benedictus pater	constituit sacrum volumen,
haec mandavitque	suis servare alumnis
Simplicius Christi	quod famulusque minister
magistri latens opus	propagavit in omnes
una tamen mercis	utroque manet in eternum.

I agree with Father Linderbauer and others that this poem is not the work of Simplicius himself, although I am not so much moved by what is called the crudity of the versification. It is crude if we conceive it as an attempt on the part of an ignoramus to write dactylic hexameter; it is not so crude if we regard it as a specimen of either free verse or polyphonic prose, varieties of simple poetry which are not peculiarly a discovery of our own generation. A later and more important specimen is the famous Hague Fragment of the tenth century, one of the Latin precursors of the Song of Roland, in which some flashes of dactylic hexameter appear and which for that reason some scholars have unfortunately attempted to restore to a consistently heroic verse. I am not trying to make out the author of the present lines one of the royal poets.

I mean merely that this sort of work might easily have been done at Monte Cassino contemporaneously with the more elegant variety practiced by the poet Marcus of that monastery, to whom Traube refers. But my reason for thinking that the poem is not by Simplicius himself is that he is given too large a mead of praise by the writer. In fact, he is put on a pedestal almost as high as that of St. Benedict himself. One pedestal bears the image of the author of the *Rule*; the other that of the man who, when the *Rule* lay comparatively unnoticed—*latens*—gave it to the world, *propagavit in omnes*. Both benefactors, the poet concludes, have won an eternal reward. No monk, I submit, whatever he thought of his performances, would herald them in such terms. The verses proceed from some scribe who was making a certain copy of the *Rule*.

What kind of a copy? What else could the achievement of Simplicius have been if not precisely some sort of an edition of the *Rule*, the purpose of which was to make the work of the Founder better known? As I pointed out in my review, it is not necessary to suppose that Simplicius intended a drastic revision of St. Benedict's Latinity. He may have introduced some corrections, but the most of his suggestions, I take it, would be written between the lines as explanatory glosses. In subsequent copies of the *Rule*, scribes might well conceive some of these to be corrections, and hence produce, by gradual stages, exactly the kind of interpolated text that we find in the manuscripts. Unless further evidence be furnished by Plenkers, from information not yet made public, I see no reason why Traube's original views, put forth by him with becoming caution, should not still hold the field.

The strength of Father Linderbauer's edition lies in his notes. They contain a veritable *grammatica Benedictina*—he has shaken down the plums. The limits of the present review prevent anything but a cursory indication of the wealth of information here contained. Several pages of *Nachträge und Berichtigungen* are added, study of which may well reveal other details to amend. Thus, in view of the frequent use of *rationabilis* by Boethius, it is questionable (p. 171) whether the word is found "vorzugsweise in der Juristensprache" and therefore is a sign that St. Benedict was especially familiar with legal terms. At the end of his notes the editor sums up, in a convenient fashion, the chief features of St. Benedict's style. A valuable set of indices renders most of the information amassed in the notes quickly accessible. I wish I could say all. A rather careful test reveals the fact that the indices are by no means complete. These defects could be easily remedied in a second edition or in a separate brochure. And even as the work stands, Father Linderbauer should win the gratitude both of the members of his Order and of all investigators of popular Latinity by his edition of the *Rule*.

E. K. RAND

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The Economic History of Rome to the End of the Republic. By TENNEY FRANK. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. Pp. ix+310.

Though we may seriously differ with Mr. Frank in some points of importance, this is a fine and stimulating book. It is not easy to grasp clearly how Mr. Frank visualizes the background of Rome, but, with some hesitation, the following may be hazarded as an outline.

The first chapter strikingly verifies Mommsen's assumption of an original dense population of small farmers in the Latin plain, so hardy, disciplined, and thriving as to hold out against the Etruscans even after these have secured Campania. They remain unaffected by the trade and commerce of Etruria and Magna Graecia. As we approach the sixth century, however, Latium presents a picture not unlike manorial England before the Black Death. These intensive tillers of little two-acre plots, for long amazingly fertile, are now villeins of manorial lords. The wealth of these lords, attested by the elaborate gold and silver ornaments of the museum, has come wholly from agriculture. Whether this situation is the result of conquest, or a slow evolution in which diminishing fertility has played a part, cannot now be determined, but landowners and land capitalists, the Roman group of these Latin lords, will remain to the end.

Rome is but a group of Latin villages on some hills by the Tiber side when the Etruscans, who had already established themselves in Latium, get possession. Etruscan princes really make the Rome of history, and there is at least some amalgamation of stock. The clients are the original farmers of the minute holdings and their obligations are much the same as those of the free villein. The plebeians are possibly the urban population of traders and craftsmen, increased perhaps by the clients lost to the lord in the city, and growing rapidly as Rome is brought into the current of Etruscan trade, along with such small independent holders as survived. Clients and plebeians are presently merged into one and spoken of now as plebians, now as peasantry. As we step out into history the plebeians appear as capable of holding land, but with little else. They have even "lost the privilege of consulting the gods officially." In the struggle which we may assume to have been long and which ended in the expulsion of the Etruscan princes, clients and plebeians must have stood to gain from both parties, but the victory is really a victory for the great landowner, as the Servian constitution testifies by giving power into his hands. Such is the background of the Republic.

The great landowners are, therefore, the patricians. Now in what does their power lie? Are they visualized as the 1,800 equites, really determining the voting in the army assembly by the fact that they vote first? Or are they also the class of average landowners at the time of the Servian constitution, whose votes added to the votes of the equites make a majority in the proportion of 98 to 186? If the latter we have a substantial state. "Loss

of the right to consult the gods officially" is a curiously baffling assumption. It presumes an original state in which plebeians could be magistrates, and therefore discloses the author's unstated conviction that client and plebeian are not the result of conquest but an economic product. For it seems certain that Mr. Frank does not assume this practical enslavement to be the work of Etruscan conquest, though he brings the Etruscans into Latium toward the close of the seventh century, while his picture of the early Latin folk is drawn from the sixth. The gods of the state which the plebeian can no longer consult can be only the patrician gods. But the religious separation of patrician goes too deep to be explained in this fashion. Philology, religious, political, and economic analogy appear to compel us to accept Ridgeway's argument for a difference in stock as conclusive. The difference is slight, but this Sabine groundwork may well have been as important for character as the Norman admixture in England.

The departure of the Etruscan tyrants is felt for the moment by the Latins as well as the plebeians as a liberation. Called into the field against the Latins, the army mutinies. The troops abandon their officers and repair under their sergeant-majors to Mons Sacer. There they peacefully remain until they obtain the extraordinary tribunate. As the one means of bettering their economic distress, the plebeians now agitate under their tribunes for political equality. At the close of a century their representations (*scita*) are so much respected that the land acquired at Veii is allotted for small farming; and in another forty years the Licinian bills complete their victory. (But these bills are as sound material as what we know of the Servian constitution, and what are we to make of the acreage allowed by the Bills for pasturage? Only the wealthy could profit by this clause. Are there not already wealthy plebeians?) Meanwhile exhaustion of the land continues, and the discovery of the possibilities in raising cattle and growing olives and vines on land exhausted for grain has obviously increased the difficulties of the small farmer, for this requires capital just as the wonderful drainage system of the sixth century. The arrival of coinage shortly before the Bills doubtless widens the distance between rich and poor, but does not produce the same acute disturbance as in the Greek world, for presently land is to come in abundantly.

However we interpret the Bills, they have given the little state life and some sense of unity. Between the Latin war and the end of the first Punic, the Romans traverse a period as fundamental for all Roman history as is for the American people the period between the expedition of Lewis and Clark and the Spanish-American War. "New lands for old" are obtained in great abundance. Conquered peoples are taken into citizen body or made allies, owing nothing to Rome except co-operation in the defense of Italy. The "new lands" are in the main allotted for small farming, not leased. In short, a noble statesmanship has made the working proprietor the basis of the state. The Roman was a stolid person, but even his imagination sometimes

caught the extraordinary significance of this century. In truth, all that is greatest and most enduring in the Roman genius was then at its maximum vitality.

But Mr. Frank is not content with this mighty amelioration of conquest and this unlettered statesmanship: Rome must also have become a pure democracy.

In 287 the plebeians by a very peculiar method used their power to establish equal manhood suffrage in legislation. They compelled the legislative assembly, which voted by classes based upon property, to recognize as of equal standing the tribal assembly which voted by wards, apparently inviting the patricians who of course were a small minority to participate in the tribal organization. Thus this state within the state, a kind of soviet government, grew, by absorbing the patrician element, to be the very state itself. . . . This was victory more than complete, and had Rome remained a state of small size, whose problems the populace had dared to settle single handed without the advice of the senate, Rome, like the Greek city states, would henceforth have provided an example of a pure democracy.

It would, indeed, by a "very peculiar process" if such were the real situation. What actually was done in this legislation will remain, perhaps, the greatest crux in the history of the Republic, but as to the result of it there can be no real doubt. So far from the "state within the state" absorbing the patricians, it is far nearer the truth to say that a new aristocracy, founded on wealth and political experience, and now strongly plebeian, is absorbing the tribunate and the plebeian assembly. It may be that the distinction of name between the assembly of the *populus* by tribes and the *concilium plebis* now disappears, but the alternative still championed by Mr. Heitland is more likely. The Romans, like the English, never destroy anything, but cumber their constitution with survivals which they somehow contrive to work, and they seem to have left three assemblies with concurrent powers of legislation. The Senate is the government, a genuine organ of the people, as a result of the Ovinian Law (? 312) virtually secondarily elective, the majority of its members having stood several times for the suffrages of the people. The tribune is now really a member of the Senate, and is becoming, as Ihne aptly called him, a minister without portfolio. Although it was the first and second Punic wars that fixed this constitutional development, the tribune is even now one of the two pillars upon which the power of this greatly altered Senate rests, the other being the censor. Thus the law of 287 is surely not a culminating victory of the People. The Romans have, indeed, become that great thing, a people, a people which from time to time asserts in healthy fashion its possession of sovereignty (conjointly with the Senate), but which has evolved an aristocratic government. They would have seemed to be on the eve of becoming a nation, but they were estopped by something more serious than economics or lack of courage to handle the greater problems presently thrust upon them. The city state localizes

citizenship as it localizes religion. If it grows afield, it is at the expense of free government. Distance co-operates with political indifference. Sooner or later the assemblies decay and become the tool of the demagogue. Rome has achieved constitutional government, but the political inventor has not yet arrived to make it possible in a city state on a scale undreamed of in the Mediterranean world. Mr. Frank knows this and may point to page iii with the retort that the foregoing is a carrying of "owls to Athens." Then why write page 45 and leave the impression with young America that the Roman Republic is what we understand by republic or by Greek democracy? In short, we may be sure that by Roman statecraft the law of 287 was seen to leave with the Senate the framing of the laws.

With the close of the first Punic war Rome comes to the turning-point in her economic development. It was not the tribute grain from Sicily that destroyed the working proprietor. The collection of it, however, was a gift of the enemy no less fatal than that other gift, the plantation. For it was at Carthage, though Mr. Frank does not note it, that the Romans first saw the new possibilities in agriculture, and it is significant that the Senate ordered Mago's work on agriculture to be translated. For the moment, however, the policy of the previous century has still a voice. Flaminius, by *direct action* against fierce opposition, carries a proposal to allot Picenum for the small farmer. The colonies at Placentia and Cremona and the great North road are in the same line, and aim at carrying small farming into the Po Valley.

But the Hannibalic war was fatal. Rome never recovered from it. This was not due to the loss of life, terrible though it was, amounting perhaps to a third of the population, but to the policy of reconstruction. It was only natural that it should appear in the immediate public interest to resort to state leases on such a scale as to attract capital. The wasted land left without owners or taken from the unfaithful allies is calculated at two million acres, half of it arable. Thus the plantation swiftly replaces the small tillage of the working proprietor. We must think not so much of the great cattle ranches in Apulia and elsewhere as of the farm illustrated by Cato, between two and three hundred acres in extent, tilled scientifically and as intensively as before, and employing a multitude of hands. In their spare time the hands are set to other industry such as the making of bricks and tiles. But the hands are slaves. The genuine Italians are now replaced by "men of Oriental, Punic and Iberian stock" and the small farmer melts away into the *plebs urbana*. From the plantation there slowly ramifies a further network of industry as the planter begins to capitalize his slaves and freedmen. These latter, becoming in time independent, increase until they offend the *haut goût* of men of letters who have forgotten the pit from which they themselves were dugged. It is a change which fundamentally alters the structure of society. Large farming becomes the rule over an acreage now twice as large as it was before the Hannibalic war, and presently it is carried into the prov-

inces. The 320,000 citizens of Gracchus' day must have had "a high per capita property rating" and many thousands of Romans must have been "well-to-do." At this point Mr. Frank deposits in a footnote the important information that before the Hannibalic war "there were nearly 20,000 citizens possessing a knight's census," adding a reference to Polybius vi. 20. But the remarks which this keen Greek observer made only three chapters earlier would appear to have had no significance for him.

The truth is that the money-making strain in the Roman character operates much farther back than Mr. Frank is willing to admit. He is hampered, no doubt, by having written his *Roman Imperialism* and has some natural weariness of the theme of new wealth. But he has also too many idols which he wishes to damage. Thus he is at pains to minimize the influence of contracting (p. 127). He cannot agree that at the time of the Hannibalic war "commercial corporations were already strong enough to demand and secure monopolistic privileges" (p. 107). He will not, of course, concede that Rhodes, Carthage, and Corinth fell victims to the commercial spirit. He is probably right as to Corinth, but earlier we find him suggesting in a footnote that "economic causes were far more important in bringing on [the Hannibalic war] than Livy supposed" (p. 89). Finally he settles the question actuarially, "As a matter of fact the actual capital engaged in public contracts probably did not reach one per cent of the amount invested in real estate in the city of Rome" (pp. 223-24).

It is important to know how these Romans invested their capital, but it is not less important to discover how they acquired it. Let us imagine this book falling into the hands of a non-academic man of large financial interests. With what a fascination he would read it! Now, does Mr. Frank really wish him to assume that from those early sixth-century days capital continued to come directly or indirectly from the land? It is to be feared that this will appear to him to be the plain contention. Yet he will himself see quickly enough from Mr. Frank's own pages that the Roman had a genius for the acquisition and employment of capital, neither primitive nor oriental, but modern and astonishing; and he will wonder whether Mr. Frank realizes it. He will also gather the impression that the author's quarrel with the Romans is that they did not anticipate the industrial revolution, and this in spite of the illuminating sentence with which the twelfth chapter closes: "It now seems a fair conclusion that Roman industry had reached as high a degree of advancement in Cicero's day as it was likely to do so long as slavery persisted." It is too bad that Mr. Frank did not devote his skill to a chapter on the evolution of the equites. After all, the planter came no more quickly than the *publican*, and the *publican* has a long ancestry. The fine chapter on Roman coinage is of itself sufficient to lead our supposed reader to suspect that some thread of economic development has been missed.

In thirteen years after the battle of Zama, Rome really became heir of Alexander the Great, and with the battle of Pydna the Roman Empire is in

being. The generation between Pydna and the Gracchi transforms the Roman Senate, once so splendid, into a plutocracy and, when the Gracchi come on the scene, no love of country could have saved the Republic. The Senate could not reform itself. The assemblies were becoming a travesty of free institutions. Even could civic virtue have been prolonged in the great mass of the people now so profoundly altered in stock, the will of the people could have had no adequate means of expression when the citizen of any worth must come up from the country to vote and the sovereign people are represented by the city mob. The heartening reflection in our vast English-speaking states, where free government is again in perplexity, lies in the fact that opinion, once it reaches the dignity of opinion, somehow makes itself effective, and that the moral basis of society, however we evade it, deny it or doubt it, is still Christian. Having said this, one must regret a very unhappy sentence in the fine chapter on the laborer: "Doubtless many a carpenter's son consoled himself with vaguely sensed beatitudes that seemed to pronounce a blessing upon the poor in spirit, the meek, the non-resisting."

The latter half of the book from chapter eight grows continually more interesting and contains a mine of fact, and references to secondary sources which make it of extreme value to a teacher of history. Mr. Frank makes no parade of these sources, which accounts no doubt for the absence of Deloume and Salvioli whose work must be familiar to him.

W. S. MILNER

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
TORONTO

Apollodorus, The Library, with an English Translation by SIR JAMES GEORGE FRAZER. In two volumes. London: William Heinemann. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921.

The editors of the Loeb Library were very fortunate in securing the editor of Pausanias to do Apollodorus' "Library" for them. They have wisely left him a free hand and he has given us much more than a bare translation of the *Bibliotheca* and the *Epitome*. The footnotes with their full references to the passages of the classics and the modern literature that treat of every myth make of these two volumes a complete handbook of Greek mythology sufficient for the needs of all but specialists. Even these will usually orient themselves here before turning to Westermann, Roscher, Preller-Robert, Baumeister, Pauly-Wissowa—and Gayley-Bulfinch. In the footnotes only an occasional illustration or apt analogy betrays the folklorist and anthropologist. In the thirteen essays of the Appendix he has full scope. There those who like that sort of thing can read about "Putting Children in the Fire," "Myths of the Origin of Fire," "The Clashing Rocks," "The Renewal of Youth," "The Legend of Oedipus," Ulysses and Polyphemus and similar *speciosa miracula*, and revel in parallels from the

"Wild Tribes of the Malay Peninsula," "Traditions of the Quinault Indians," "Kathlamet Texts," and "Folk Tales of Salisham and Sahiptan Tribes." A full index completes the equipment of these indispensable volumes.

There is little to add in the way of criticism. The introductory discussion of the "Author and his Book" follows the 1873 dissertation of C. Robert more implicitly than I would do without a meticulous verification for which time and space fail. The manuscripts and editions are enumerated after the preface of Wagner's Teubner text of 1894. Variations from Wagner's text are noted. Mr. Frazer has collated no manuscripts and admits few and slight emendations. The resultant text of the *Epitome* is printed as a continuous story and not in parallel columns for the Vatican and Sabbaitic versions as in Wagner. In 1. 328 I miss a reference to Professor Kittredge's article on armpitting in *A.J.P.*, Vol. VI, p. 151. In 1. 265 the spelling Creophilus (*sic*) of Samos must be a misprint. In 1. 361 I cannot account for "the Thebaid of Callinus an early elegiac poet," except by supposing that Mr. Frazer has lost his way in recent Homeric controversies. The translation of ἀρθρα "joints" in 2. 105 is presumably intentional.

PAUL SHOREY

Quellenuntersuchungen zu Nemesios von Emesa. VON HEINRICH A. KOCH. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1921.

The University of Leipzig like the University of Chicago no longer requires publication of doctoral dissertations. It is greatly to the credit of Dr. Koch that in these discouraging times he has had the courage to publish for himself so abstruse and remote an inquiry. In the first part of his study he endeavors to show that the probable source of many, if not all, of Nemesios' philosophical ideas is Origenes' *Commentary on Genesis*, which in turn, as he thinks Jaeger and others have proved, depends on Posidonius' *Commentary on the Timaeus*. I have little to add to what I said in my review of Jaeger in *Classical Philology*, X, 483. Dr. Koch admits that Nemesios was no slavish copyist but a writer of broad culture and capable of some independence of thought. He nevertheless maintains that the parallels between his philosophical ideas and those of Origenes against Celsus make it probable that his chief source was the *Commentary on Genesis* where the ideas of the treatise against Celsus would naturally recur. I admit the possibility, but hold that the breadth and range of ancient culture, which Quellenforschung is apt to underrate, makes all results obtainable by this general parallelism of commonplaces uncertain. For example, Nemesios approves as a "Hebrew dogma" the idea that nature and the animals were made for man. Celsus, as reported by Origenes, ridicules this as a Christian doctrine and therefore, it is argued, Nemesios must have found it in Origenes on *Genesis*. But the same Epicurean polemic is found in Lucretius (5. 156) and Origenes himself points out that Celsus' censure applies no less to the Stoic Pronoia than to the Christians. Cf.

Cicero *De Nat. Deor.* 2.58 and 1.9.23. Dr. Koch's other parallels, many of which are very interesting, are open to the same general objection. He himself concludes that his theory, if not "stringent bewiesen," is highly probable.

A second part shows in greater detail what we already knew, that Nemesios' discussion of the freedom of the will closely follows Aristotle's *Ethics*. He is mistaken in supposing that Gercke, *Rhein. Mus.*, XLI (1886), pp. 266-91, and Domanski, "Die Psychologie des Nemesios" (*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, 1900), were the first to observe this. No reader of Nemesios who knew the *Ethics* could fail to note what is already mentioned in the dedication of his edition to Cardinal Perrotte by Ellebodium in 1564: *περὶ ὧν ὁ τε Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ τῶν ἠθικῶν καὶ ὁ Δαμασκηνὸς Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ τῆς ὁρθοδόξου πίστεως ἐκδόσει σχεδὸν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ῥήμασι διαλέγονται.*

PAUL SHOREY

Alliteratio Latina or Alliteration in Latin Verse Reduced to Rule with Special Reference to Catullus, Horace, Juvenal, Lucan, Lucretius, Martial, Ovid, Persius, Phaedrus, Priapeia, Propertius, Statius, Tibullus, and Virgil. By WALTER J. EVANS. London: Williams & Norgate, 1921. Pp. xxxiv+195. 18s.

To understand the purpose of this elaborate work we must define alliteration, as the author does, so as to cover every variety of internal rhyme. From this starting-point and frequently fortified by analogies from the bardic literature of his native Wales, he essays to establish as the fundamental rule of alliterative verse (p. 43) that "subject to certain indulgences, every ictic syllable must rhyme with some other ictic syllable in its own line." As a necessary preliminary for determining the possibilities of rhyme in Latin he very properly devotes a considerable part of the work (pp. 7-17, 120-64) to a discussion of the sounds of Latin letters, particularly their sounds when juxtaposed to other letters in a word or phrase (*sandhi*).¹ By admitting as satisfactory rhyming equivalents (pp. 16-17) such groups as *b, p, f*; *c, g, k, q, x*; *d, t, z*; *m, n*; *s, x, z*; and perhaps *h, f* among the consonants and *ā, ai, au*; *ō, au*; *ē, ae*; *i, y, ei* (diphthong); *ō, oe, oi*; and *ū, eu* among the vowels he finds the alliterative elements reduced to sixteen: *a, b, c, d, e, h, i, j, l, m, n, o, r, s, u, v* and their equivalents.² With this limited number of elements, and

¹ Some of the observations on sounds will not command universal assent, e.g. the assumption of a long *a* in *magnus* (pp. 35, 170); the etymologies accepted on page 153 in justification of certain pronunciations; and some of the quantities in an elaborate table (pp. 177-84) of hidden quantities. And would an Italian, for example, familiar with the full pronunciation of double letters, accept the statement (p. 12) that "a double letter has no more alliterative value than a single"?

² The short vowels he discards from consideration (p. 4) as ineffective in rhymes.

with five rather generous classes of exceptions or "indulgences,"¹ and the further aid of *liaison* (linking of a final consonant to a following vowel)² and ligation (attraction of a following initial consonant by the final vowel of a preceding word, e.g. *visuperum*), which conveniently allow the end of the preceding and the beginning of the following lines to compensate for deficiencies in the lines for which ictic rhymes are sought, it is perhaps not surprising, according to mathematical possibilities, that the requirements which Professor Evans sets up should be frequently satisfied. The unsophisticated among us, however, who may perhaps be able to feel the alliteration in *mater, optumarum multo mulier melior mulierum* or *O Tite tute Tati tibi tanta tyranne tulisti*, will hardly, I fear, thrill at such examples of "rhyme" as (p. 50) *mort/nárras ét, genus Aécí* (analyzed as r, s s C) or (p. 51) *ad úmbilicúm addúceré/non díliter* (d c dc n), and will require special education to appreciate the full subtlety of such an apparently innocent line as (p. 82) *cúm Venus ét Iunó sociósqúe Hymenaeús ad ígnes* when explained as

cm.nst	n.s	cmn.sd	n.s
mv	osc	osc	vm nes nes

Yet in time even we may perhaps be trained to hear in *tuis* not only *tv vi is* but also *ti vs ts* (p. 58)! At times some doubts have apparently occurred to Professor Evans himself, as when he states (p. 75) that the method of treatment of certain groups is "largely a matter for the eye," or when he admits (p. ix) that "in straining after richness and symmetry in a sphere where the data are often uncertain, I may have seen much that a Roman would not have missed."

Just how invariably the principles here set forth apply in Latin verse it is a little hard to state. In ordinary cases a reviewer would make his own tests and discover, but so dexterous is Professor Evans in interpreting his elaborate indulgences and so fantastical is the dainty structure that an indolent reviewer hesitates to tamper with it. The author, however, tells us (p. ix) that he has examined over 100,000 lines; on page 55 he reports only nine cases of a certain form in 12,915 lines of Virgil; on pages 22 and 70-72 he presents analyses of entire odes of Horace; and throughout the work there are abundant lines adduced as illustration and the impression is conveyed that the author believes the rules to be of general application. Yet if such regularity really underlies classical Latin verse it is remarkable that no Latin writer definitely recognizes the phenomenon (p. xxv), in view of allusions to recurrent initials, homoeoteleuton, etc. The silence of antiquity—and

¹ An ictic may rhyme (1) with a like letter which lies between it and the next ictic syllable; (2) with a like initial letter in any word within the line; (3) with a like letter in a companion line. An ictic syllable may be rhymeless (1) provided there is compensation within the line (compensatory rhymes being of various sorts), or (2) even without compensation in one foot of the first and last lines in lyrics (the "privileged" line).

² But if the end of a verse constitutes a pause (p. 144) how can we allow ligation and *liaison* to bind line to line? This the author recognizes (p. 164) but does not explain.

Professor Evans has made careful study of the teachings of the grammarians in search of light upon this question—combined with the obvious artificiality of attempts to fit some lines into this alliterative scheme, lead the reviewer to feel that, although the author has made many useful and interesting suggestions, it would be safer not to ride this horse so hard. May not Roman poets have felt that variety was here preferable to rule? And is not an embellishment occasionally employed and clearly felt superior to a “rule” too subtle to be readily perceptible to the ear and cumbered with so many elaborate exceptions as to raise the question whether it is a rule after all? Just as refrains, instead of appearing with fixed regularity, may be used (as in Virgil’s eighth eclogue and in the *Pervigilium Veneris*) with even greater effectiveness from the very irregularity of the intervals of their occurrence, and as rhymes, in the usual sense of that term, are found in classical Latin as occasional and striking ornaments (as in Cicero’s poem on his consulship and in the internal rhymes of the Ovidian pentameter), so alliterations of the subtler types may have been consciously employed with less of mechanical regularity and hence with more varied and specialized effects than the hard-and-fast scheme of Professor Evans would admit. Even those, if there be such, who are prepared to accept the author’s entire contention, will feel, I think, some disappointment that he has not developed this topic of the special and often onomatopoeic effects of different forms of alliteration. Do individual writers favor particular combinations? I suspect that a study of Cicero’s hexameters would reveal an especial fondness for *-nt-* and *-nd-*sounds. Beyond the acknowledgment (pp. xxii-xxiv) of the observations of Ellis, Conington, Sidgwick, Munro, and others, there seems to be no hint that our author has given the matter attention, or even that one alliterative star differs from another in glory. Perhaps to stress individual cases would weaken the claims of the general rule, but it can hardly be the case that there is not great difference in this regard between different authors, just as there is in the matter of meter, in which the possibilities of variation are obviously much fewer.

Nor is there indication of differences in treatment between authors of different periods. It is unfortunate that, even if the author’s time forbade a study of the question in Greek poetry (from which, a priori, we should expect such an embellishment to have been derived), he did not at least include in his investigations the early Latin poetry, where even the novice cannot fail to be struck by abundant and varied types (as in Plautus, Ennius, Accius, Pacuvius, and even Cicero). We might then more fully understand the change of taste in alliterative styles between the time of Ennius and that of Cicero which Professor Evans detects (p. xxvi) in a statement of Servius. And what of prose alliteration? If prose, like verse, has its hidden reefs of rhythmical structure, are there in it also dangerous sunken mines of alliteration among which we have hitherto been unwittingly and innocently sailing? Here is clearly the raw material for many a doctor’s dissertation!

But Professor Evans marches with a confidence which we must admire, even when we watch but from afar. Not satisfied with suggesting (p. 72) a system of grading alliterative lines in order of merit (in a manner worthy of an expert in "educational measurements"),¹ he decides (pp. 94-102) between variant readings, and even emends (cf. pp. 191-92) the poets themselves on the basis of the rules, indulgences, compensations, ligations, *liaisons*, etc. already established (which strikes the lay mind as perilously near to reasoning in a circle), while elsewhere he states (p. 141) that no theory proposed for the sound of final *m* before a following consonant "will fit in with the facts as they present themselves to the author, who finds *inter alia* that they will not work under his alliterative scheme," and again (pp. 149-50) he is constrained to emend the testimony of one grammarian and to reject that of another. All of which raises the question why it is that the present age, so indifferent as a whole to clearly recognizable rules and standards, should be one in which the scholarly world is most industrious in discovering recondite and highly complex laws of *clausulae*, alliteration, architectural refinements, and dynamic symmetry.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C.; A Study in Economic History. By MICHAEL ROSTOVITZ. University of Wisconsin: Studies in the Social Sciences and History, Number 6. Madison, 1922. Pp. x+209. \$2.00.

To his other studies on the economic life of the ancient world, Professor Rostovtzeff has added the present volume, treating in detail the rich but widely scattered series of some 350 documents from the private archives of a certain Zenon, a collection unearthed in 1915 and the following years on the site of ancient Philadelphia.

The great importance of these papyri, and hence of Professor Rostovtzeff's present volume, lies in the light they cast on the first century of Greek rule in Egypt, a period in which the Ptolemies were compelled to restore the economic life of the country and to rebuild a properly organized administration, in other words to rescue the country from the political, industrial, commercial, and agricultural decay into which it had sunk during the period of Assyrian and Persian control.

Practically all of the documents discussed have already been published during the past seven years, but this is the first attempt to treat them as a whole and to relate them to other documents, such as the Petrie papyri, and

¹ "It would almost seem that by assigning appropriate numerical values to the various embellishments, and making due deductions for recurring words, ill-managed recurring syllables, cacophonous groupings, spurious doubles, and the like, the alliterative merit of a line might be expressed in mathematical terms." Alas! *mathematicis* "esse poetis/non homines, non di, non concessere columnae."

to the Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus. As the author points out, this is worth doing now even though other documents from the same source, still unpublished, may change certain details of his work.

Zenon was a subordinate of Apollonius, the manager in the name of Ptolemy II of all economic activities in Egypt and the official through whom apparently the first great efforts at economic revival were made. It seems likely that the minute elaboration of the economic and administrative system which characterizes the later Ptolemaic period was largely if not entirely inaugurated during the fifteen years in which Apollonius held his office as business manager of the kingdom. Not only was Apollonius one of the chief officers of the crown, but at the same time he was a great merchant, shipmaster, and landowner with interests in Syria and Palestine as well as in Egypt. For two years at least Zenon was the business manager of all the private affairs of Apollonius, standing in the same relation to him that the latter stood to the king. Later he became manager of the estates in the Arsinoite nome held by Apollonius as a grant from the king and as such apparently responsible for the administration of Philadelphia. After the death of Philadelphus and the downfall of his patron, Zenon remained in Philadelphia playing the rôle of a powerful and rich landowner himself.

Although there are some exceedingly interesting pages devoted to Zenon's activities before coming to Philadelphia, Professor Rostovtzeff's main effort is to describe the manifold operations incident to large scale agricultural activity in Egypt. It is perhaps the most satisfactory as well as the most complete treatise available on this subject.

After discussing in an illuminating way the question of "gift" estates under the early Ptolemies, Professor Rostovtzeff treats in turn the various phases of the great landowner's activities: the preparation of the estate for cultivation, agriculture, viniculture, market gardening, stockbreeding, and the financing, sales, and transportation of the produce. Certain appendices are added, of which the most interesting perhaps are those treating the history of the Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus and the breeding of cavalry horses in the same reign.

One would like space to mention many of the interesting facts brought out by Professor Rostovtzeff, such as the efforts to import new varieties of vegetables and to improve the breed of sheep. One must not, however, fail to emphasize the light cast by these papyri on the efforts of the Ptolemies to tie their Greek subjects, civilian as well as military, to the country without establishing them in Greek cities with the resultant opportunities for trouble such as characterize the history of Alexandria, and which if duplicated throughout the Nile Valley would have inevitably meant a complete breakdown of the Ptolemaic administrative machinery. It is not the least value of the Zenon papyri that they indicate, even if only partially, the means by which Philadelphus tied the Alexandrian Greeks to Alexandria and the Greeks in the country to the country.

LOUIS C. WEST

